THE CHAONIAN DOVE

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM NONAGESIMUM QUARTUM

A. J. BOYLE

THE CHAONIAN DOVE

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXXVI

THE CHAONIAN DOVE

Studies in the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid of Virgil

BY

A.J. BOYLE

LEIDEN E.J. BRILL 1986

ISBN 90 04 07672 7

Copyright 1986 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

FOR KATHY, JAMES AND JUDY

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

But our songs
Have as much strength, Lycidas, among the spears of Mars
As, they say, have Chaonian doves when the eagle comes.

Virgil, *Eclogue* 9

CONTENTS

Preface IX
Abbreviations XI

I. Introduction : The Failed Text 1
II. Pastoral Meditation : The *Eclogues* 15
III. Didactic Paradox : The *Georgics* 36
IV. Epic Vision : The *Aeneid* (1) 85
V. Epic Vision : The *Aeneid* (2) 133
Appendix : The Historical Background 177
List of Modern Works Cited 180

General Index 185
Index Locorum 192

PREFACE

This is the first book-length critical study of the three Virgilian works to be published in English since Brooks Otis' celebrated inquiry, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964). It examines separately and in detail the thematic design and intent of the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, and documents the development of their political, moral and poetic pessimism. The book is in three main parts—'Pastoral Meditation', 'Didactic Paradox', 'Epic Vision'—corresponding to the three Virgilian texts. A brief introductory chapter is concerned with questions of method and the problem of Virgil misread. The book is a development of earlier essays published by me in *Ramus* 1 (1972), 4 (1975) and 8 (1979), and offers a substantial reassessment of Virgil's poetic *œuvre*.

All Latin texts are translated. The majority of those who will read this book will be students of classical literature in translation with little or no knowledge of Latin. They constitute the bulk of Virgil's contemporary readership. If Virgil or any classical poet still has a role to play in the culture, it is because of and by means of such readers. Contemporary criticism must be accessible to them. This book is addressed to them as much as it is to the professional scholar and to teachers and students of Latin.

The translations throughout the book are my own, and aim at a high level of verbal and stylistic accuracy. They are with few exceptions line-by-line, and employ for the Virgilian hexameter a five or six stress line of eleven to fifteen syllables. The syllabic and stress variation is similar to that used by Virgil, whose hexameter varies in length from thirteen to seventeen syllables and, despite its unfailing adherence to six metrical 'beats' or *ictus*, not infrequently has five and not six stresses. An identical scheme was used for my *The Eclogues of Virgil* (Melbourne 1976), from which the translations of the *Eclogues* in this book are taken.

The book is published with the aid of a subvention from the Monash University Publications Committee. I offer the Committee my sincere thanks. My other debts are many. The benefit I have derived from the 'new critical' work of the last twenty-five years can be gauged from the plethora of references to it in the notes accompanying each chapter. Disagreement is often index of substantial indebtedness. To colleagues, friends and students in Australia, England and North America, who have been exposed to my views for a decade or more and have responded to them with fine criticism and insight, I owe more than can be reckoned. If I mention by name Bob Coleman, Peter Connor, Peter Davis, Gerald Fitzgerald, Guy Lee, John Penwill, Michael Putnam, Charles Segal and Deryck Williams, it is not

because they will approve of what this book contains, but because without their collaborative friendship and the humane scholarship which they represent this book would be even poorer than it is. It is dedicated to three people, with whom in a garden on the Palatine I saw the fragments of a dream.

Monash University
Melbourne
December 1984

A. J. B.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the Notes and the List of Modern Works Cited.

AC	Acta Classica
AJP	American Journal of Philology
CJ	Classical Journal
C&M	Classica et Mediaevalia
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	Classical Review
CSCA	California Studies in Classical Antiquity
EMC	Échos du Monde Classique
G&R	Greece and Rome
HSCP	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
LEC	Les Études Classiques
MLN	Modern Language Notes
PVS	Proceedings of the Virgil Society
REA	Revue des Études Anciennes
REL	Revue des Études Latines
RFIC	Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
UCPCP	University of California Publications in Classical Philology
YCS	Yale Classical Studies

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE FAILED TEXT

> Can I say 'bububu' and mean 'If it doesn't rain I shall go for a walk'?
>
> Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* 18a

Reinterpretations of literary texts generally make one of three assumptions: the text has no (logically) decidable meaning;[1] the text has many decidable, even contradictory meanings, is *intrinsically* polysemous;[2] the text has failed. The first assumption allows — in addition to deconstruction — an endless process of mental structuration statements; the second permits a plurality of differing, even contradictory statements, each equally valid; the third, based on the notion of decidable, exclusive meaning and its corollary of a limited range of hermeneutic validity, postulates a text misread. The first two assumptions are not shared by the interpretive studies of Virgil's poetry contained in the following chapters. Arguments used in their support have been considered and rejected. Advocated with ensorcelling rhetoricity and labyrinthine brilliance, their theses about text conspicuously ignore either that language employed in

---

[1] See Derrida's influential theory of *texte* as *tissu de signes*, marked by *discontinuité* and *immotivation*: J. Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris 1967) 26, 65 and *passim*. Derrida's vocabulary of *trace*, *reserve* and *différance* (p. 142) constitute a *bravura* attempt to explain the actual meaningfulness of texts from within the confines of a theory which dictates their lack of meaning. See also Barthes' description of *le texte absolument pluriel*:

> Ce texte est une galaxie de signifiants, non une structure de signifiés; il n'a pas de commencement; il est réversible; on y accède par plusieurs entrées dont aucune ne peut être à coup sûr déclarée principale; les codes qu'il mobilise se profilent *à perte de vue*, ils sont indécidables (le sens n'y est jamais soumis à un principe de décision, sinon par coup de dés); de ce texte absolument pluriel, les systèmes de sens peuvent s'emparer, mais leur nombre n'est jamais clos, ayant pour mesure l'infini du langage. (R. Barthes, S/Z [Paris 1970] 12).

[2] A corollary of the 'democratic', 'autocratic', 'historical relativist' and 'culturalist' positions in hermeneutics, now widespread. For a recent example in the area of classical literature see William Arrowsmith's attempts to justify the discordance between his own interpretation of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* and that of George Dimock: 'The true classic, the so-called "inexhaustible" thing, is by definition never fully revealed; it is always waiting to disclose itself. Like Cézanne's wonderful array of Mont Sainte-Victoires, the sense of identical mountain-mass and scale is an illusion; the enduring rock changes constantly, with every hour, in every light and every season, with every alteration in vantage, weather, and perspective, endlessly disclosing itself as we, from our changing foreground, watch it or slowly revolve around it' (*Euripides: Iphigenia at Aulis*, trans. W. S. Merwin and George E. Dimock Jr. [Oxford 1978] XIII). Arrowsmith's confusion — between (a) the viewer's sense of the pictured rock, which changes from picture to picture, (b) the viewer's sense of what each picture pictures, which need not vary greatly from viewer to viewer or from viewing to viewing, and (c) the viewer's perception of the rock itself, which varies considerably in accordance with light and weather conditions, etc. — seems extraordinary.

accordance with certain rules and conventions necessarily generates meaning (even the texts of those who deny the meaningfulness of texts have decidable meaning, if rarely any *plaisir*), or that for texts to have meaning there necessarily have to be meanings which they do not have. If a text means everything, it means nothing. Other mistakes evident in both assumptions similarly arrest: the blatant disregard of literature's teleological nature, its relation to authorial design and intent; the disregard too of the reader's assumption of authorial intent (his belief that the words come out of a head, not a hat) and his employment of that assumption in the activity of making sense of text; the reduction of literature to semiological game, to self-reflexive or semantic play, to — in Robbe-Grillet's trivialising phrase — 'une organisation ludique'.[3] Both assumptions devalue literature and are false.

Qualifications intrude. The elementary truth needs stating for all its elementariness that the process of construing meaning in the case of a literary text is often far from easy. 'The poem' wrote Wallace Stevens, 'must resist the intelligence/Almost successfully'. And certainly — at least where great literature is concerned — complexity and subtlety of intelligence, expertise, sensibility, discrimination, are required by the complexity and subtlety of the literary text. Required too by the variformity of that complexity. For the resistance to the intelligence which in a sense defines the literary text (and is the source of much of its peculiar profundity) differs markedly in extent, mode, force. Not all texts are hermetic. Not all are palimpsestic. Conventions exploited, rules of significance, models of intelligibility implied are as various as the forms of linguistic life. Some texts in fact make moderate demands on the literary competence of their readers; the intricacy of the demands of others seems so extraordinary that access to the less superficial levels of such texts appears barred to all but a few. But even in the case of the less exacting text recuperation, integration, interpretation require attention, feeling, intelligence, judgment, and knowledge of how literature works. Irony, imagery, tone, symbolism, point of view are often problematic in any text. As are ambiguity and ambivalence. Occasions arise where the latter seem an intended feature of text (this has nothing to do with the so-called 'intrinsic polysemousness' of literature) and hence should not be dissolved; others where they seem product of reader ignorance. Certain difficulties may never be resolved. There are occasions, for example, not infrequent perhaps in the case of ancient literature, where the paucity of data supplied by the literary text and/or by the social and cultural context in which it was written make a decision between alternative interpretations impossible to justify. None of these difficulties, however, affects

[3] The phrase is taken from Alain Robbe-Grillet's article in *Le Nouvel Observateur* (Paris) of 26 June 1970.

either the soundness of the theoretical position of exclusive, decidable meaning and its corollary of restricted hermeneutic validity, or the methodological appropriateness of the employment of standard verification techniques in the interpretive process itself. As to the issue of material evidence, it is a contention of this book that the Virgilian *œuvre* does not present an occasion where paucity of textual or historical data precludes determinate interpretation. On the contrary, the following studies of Virgil's text attempt to draw attention in their argument to the presence of enough data for decisions to be reached about meaning and intent.

Text Misread

The problem of the failed text remains. Why has Virgil's text been so misread? It certainly has been read. Ovid underestimated:

> Tityrus et fruges Aeneiaque arma legentur
> Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit.
>
> (*Amores* 1.15.25 f.)
>
> Tityrus and crops and Aeneas' arms will be read
> While Rome is capital of the conquered world.

Dante's Beatrice did not:

> O anima cortese mantoana,
> di cui la fama ancor nel mondo dura
> e durerà quanto 'l mondo lontana.
>
> (*Inferno* 2.58-60)
>
> O courteous spirit of that Mantuan
> Whose fame endures still in the world
> And shall endure while the world lasts.

But, as the history of Virgilian reading demonstrates, to be read is not necessarily to be understood; *la fama* entails little but itself. Its association with texts widely and significantly misread serves only to make the misreading of those texts more curious, indeed profoundly ironic. And more demanding of explanation.

To repeat: why has Virgil's text been so misread? Answers bound up with the philological, non-literary orientation of traditional classical scholarship (including ancient classical scholarship)[4] only partially illumine. A more important aspect of the answer, perhaps, affecting scholar and general reader alike, lies in the semiological complexity of Virgil's poetic text itself: the allusiveness and esotericism of the Alexandrianising *Eclogues*, whose devel-

---

[4] On the pedantic preoccupation with grammatical and verbal *minutiae* which defined both ancient Roman scholarship and the teaching of poetry in the schools, see E. J. Kenney, 'Books and Readers in the Roman World', in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1982) 7 and 29.

oped intricacy of thought and verbal and thematic counterpoint (emblematised in Virgil's image of the *Eclogues* as a woven or 'texted' basket — *fiscellam texit*, *E.* 10.71) are matched only by a beguiling verbal elegance which has gained surface popularity for the poems at the expense of intellectual neglect; or again the paradoxical mode and deceptive form of the *Georgics*, in which not only is the work's ostensible didacticism a metaphor for a more profound didacticism but the latter exhibits itself not through univocal implication but through conceptual and ideological dissonance; or the thematic and poetic complexity of the *Aeneid*, whose very size and subtle manipulation of an immense range of verbal, imagistic, historical and narrative detail require the most assiduous and reflective attention if something other than superficial contact is to be achieved. Each of the three works makes formidable individual demands on the literary competence of its readers; each work's separate, creative interaction with the pre-Virgilian literary tradition (not 'copying' as Page,[5] nor simply *intertextualité*, unless construed as a function of poetic design) alone poses substantial problems of interpretation. And, given the peculiar and self-conscious unity of Virgil's poetic *œuvre*, its complex system of evolving themes, images, structures, its bonding network of inter-poem reference, each text has to be understood not only in itself but in terms of its relationship to the others. Interplay with its own historical context is in the case of a Virgilian text product in part of interplay both with the Graeco-Roman poetic tradition and with the total Virgilian *œuvre*.

Nor has reader-response to the semiological demands of Virgil's text been assisted by the evaluative and thematic assumptions of the theory of literary kinds. Like the Alexandrian bipartition into 'high' and 'low' styles (later developed into the tripartite schema: 'high', 'middle' and 'low'), the theory of kinds was essentially descriptive; it furnished in the best Peripatetic tradition an 'objective' classification of literary species and forms. Evaluative, hierarchical judgments were, however, built into the theory from the start — tragedy and comedy, claims Aristotle, are respectively 'greater and more prized forms' than epic and iambic lampoon[6] — and these, together with the thematic imperatives of the theory, led inevitably to generic misreading and the trivialisation of complex individual texts. The *Eclogues* are patent paradigm. Despite their overt concern with contemporary (and not only contemporary) moral and social issues, with human possibilities and human distress, with poetry's power to effect and to change, these profoundly meditative poems became subject to hermeneutic judgments derived from pastoral's location as a minor kind. Misreadings such as, for example, those of Page (1898), for whom the *Eclogues* are 'studies ... not deserving to rank with the mature and

[5] T. E. Page (ed.), *Virgil: Bucolics and Georgics* (London 1898) x.
[6] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1449a 2 ff.

complete works of his genius',[7] and Dudley (1969), who sees the *Eclogues* (apart from 4) as 'slight but charming',[8] stem in part from the trivialisation of pastoral displayed by the European critical tradition from Quintilian to Johnson. Sidney's comment (1583) that 'the Pastorall poem' is the place 'where the hedge [of Poetrie] is lowest' typifies.[9] Indeed Virgil might himself be thought to support this trivialising attitude to pastoral: his tamarisks are proclaimed 'lowly' (*humiles*), his song 'lean-spun' (*deductum*), his rustic reed 'thin' (*tenui*). Such language of course evidences Virgil's awareness of an established hierarchy of kinds and styles, but, far from testifying to a belief in the evaluative assumptions of that or any other hierarchy, it demonstrates the Eclogue poet's allegiance to the canons of a poetics — the poetics of Callimachus and of the Roman neoterics — the ideological intent and effect of which, exemplified by its declaration of the obsolescence of heroic epic and concomitant advocacy of small-scale, finely crafted, intellectually subtle, allusive, tensile poetry, was the subversion of the traditional hierarchy of poetic modes and forms. It is too frequently forgotten — or not recognised — that Virgil's *Eclogues* are in a very strong formal sense the climax and the culmination of Roman neotericism. Who takes Catullus at his word when he refers to his own verse as 'junk' (*nugae*)?

Generic misreading has affected interpretation of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* too. Clearly not a verse treatise on farm husbandry (comparison with Varro of Reate and Columella is informative here), the *Georgics* was nevertheless admired as such by Alamanni and more generally in sixteenth century France and is still considered such in some quarters today (Scullard [1963]: 'A didactic poem ... giving practical advice to farmers').[10] Seneca knew better: *nec agricolas docere uoluit, sed legentes delectare* ('he intended not to instruct farmers, but to delight readers', *Ep. Mor.* 86.15). There were of course 'generic' and 'historical' reasons for the agronomic handbook approach. In the Hellenistic period, from which Roman neotericism drew so much of its poetic theory and practice, versified treatises on such subjects as astronomy, husbandry, noxious animals, herbs, cookery, fishing, zoology and even extraordinary rivers abounded, from one of which, Nicander's *Georgika*, Virgil borrowed at least the title of his poem, and from another, Aratus' *Phainomena* — more particularly its supplement, the *Diosemeia* ('Weather Signs') — material for *Georgic* 1. The similarities between the *Georgics* and the works of the Alexandrian metaphrasts are, however, few and slight, the differences many, profound and determinant; but the latter, blurred by the superficial observations of generic inclusiveness, have often signally failed to impress.

[7] Page [5] xv.
[8] D. R. Dudley, *The Penguin Companion to Literature* IV (Harmondsworth 1969) 173.
[9] Sidney, *The Defense of Poesie*, c. 29 (first published after Sidney's death in 1595).
[10] H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero* (2nd ed., London 1963) 245.

More important for the understanding of the *Georgics* than its relationship to alleged Hellenistic precursors is the poem's indebtedness — both formal and substantive — to the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius, but even here the 'generic' relationship between the two works seems often to have obscured the fact that, whereas in Lucretius didactic intent and overt technical substance coalesce, in Virgil they do not. Whatever else it may be, Virgil's poetry is certainly not honey to sweeten the medicine of agronomic instruction. Indeed, approached by way of the genre assumptions of the theory of literary kinds, even the debt to Hesiod — potentially perhaps the most revealing debt of all — can seriously mislead.

The truth is — the expression seems bolder than it is — that the *Georgics* is not a versified agricultural handbook, nor even a versified agricultural handbook enlivened by 'set-pieces' and rhetorical *tours de force*, nor is it essentially descriptive poetry interlaced with philosophical and political ideas.[11] 'A continuous whole', as Otis remarks, 'concerned with the most central and serious themes of Augustan Rome',[12] it is both a didactic work and a thematically organic work, but its didacticism has little to do with husbandry, as Chapter III attempts to show.

But it is perhaps the *Aeneid*'s generic misreading that most arrests. Derived in part from a genre conflation of epic and panegyric, in part from the work's contemporary misreception, it illustrates the difficulty of reading any revolutionary text that combines subtle subversion of literary and historical expectation with the most exacting intellectual demands of its readers. Bowra's statement well captures the prevailing literary assumptions at the time of the *Aeneid*'s genesis:

> Both at Rome and in the Renaissance the epic was thought to be the grandest and noblest form of poetry and the right means to celebrate great achievements. No doubt its scale was felt to be appropriate to such subjects. Its mere size appealed to a love of grandeur and magnificence. But more important was the spirit of the epic, its attempt to find significance in the achievements of man and to show him in his essential nobility.[13]

Aristotle in fact (*Poetics* 1448b 8ff.) had explicitly aligned epic and *encomia*; while at Rome itself the established tradition of Roman panegyric-historical epic (Naevius, Ennius, Accius, Volusius, Hortensius, Cornelius Severus, etc.)[14] and the manifest pressure exerted by Caesar Octavian/Augustus on the post-Actium generation of poets to have his *laudes* sung (see, for example, Horace *Odes* 1.12, 3.25; Propertius 2.10, 3.4) seem to have combined to produce a

---

[11] Essentially the view of L. P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey* (Cambridge 1969).

[12] B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964) 145.

[13] C. M. Bowra, *From Virgil to Milton* (London 1945) 12f.

[14] See Otis [12] 20ff.

climate in which Virgil's epic masterwork would almost inevitably be misunderstood. The conspicuous association of epic with eulogy, especially political eulogy, in the *recusationes* of Horace and Propertius (see, for example, Horace *Odes* 1.6, *Ep* 2.1. 245ff.; Propertius 2.1, 3.3, 3.9) reflects and confirms both the literary assumptions of the 20s B.C. and the unconcealed Augustan 'pressure'. Indeed even before the *Aeneid*'s publication (against Virgil's wishes, if we are to believe the *Vitae*)[15] its association with political eulogy seemed already to have been determined. Thus in a poem perhaps as early as 26 B.C.:

me iuuet hesternis positum languere corollis,
  quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus;
Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi,
  Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis,
qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma
  iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.
cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai!
  nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.

(Propertius 2.34.59-66)

Be it for me to lie languishing with yesterday's garlands,
  Whom the sure-aiming god has touched to the bone;
For Virgil to have power to tell of Actium's shores
  In Phoebus' guard and Caesar's gallant ships,
Who now wakes to life the arms of Troy's Aeneas
  And walls cast down on Lavinian shores.
Surrender, writers of Rome, surrender, Greeks!
  Something greater than the *Iliad* is born.

Augustan panegyric of the kind attributed to Virgil's friend Varius (quoted according to Porphyrio by Horace at *Ep*. 1.16. 27ff.) similarly shaped expectation. After the *Aeneid*'s publication, neither Horace's 'laureate' poems (for example, *Carmen Saeculare*, *Odes* 4.4, 4.15) nor Propertius' mock laudations (4.6, for example) nor even Ovid's (arguably) subtly parodic treatment of Aeneas and Augustus in the *Metamorphoses* (Books 13-15) would have done anything other than confirm the *laudes* reading.

Much stemmed from the authority of this original misreception. Thus Tiberius Claudius Donatus (fourth century A.D.): *talem enim monstrare Aenean debuit, ut dignus Caesari, in cuius honorem haec scribebantur, parens et auctor generis praeberetur* ('he had to depict Aeneas as a worthy first ancestor of Caesar, in whose honour it was written');[16] thus Servius (also fourth century A.D.): *intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus* ('Virgil's intention is to imitate Homer and to praise Augustus by

[15] See, e.g., Servius, *In Verg. Aen. i Praef.*: *eam moriens praecepit incendi* ('Dying, he instructed that it be burned'); and the Suetonius-Donatus *Vita* 39-40.

[16] *Prooem. Aen. i.*

means of his ancestors').[17] Commentators in the middle ages, when they restrained their passion for allegory, echoed these sentiments, occasionally expanding *laudes Augusti* into *laudes Romanorum: ille* [*Homerus*] *in laudem Graecorum, hic autem* [*Vergilius*] *in gloriam Romanorum conscripsit* ('The one [Homer] wrote to praise the Greeks, the other [Virgil] to glorify the Romans': ninth century *vita*).[18] Camões, Spenser, Tasso, the Renaissance — its editions encrusted with the interpretations of the ancients[19] — naturally concurred.[20] As did Dryden (1697): 'To infuse an awful Respect into the People towards such a Prince [Augustus]: By that respect to confirm their obedience to him, and by that Obedience to make them Happy. This was the Moral of his Divine Poem: Honest in the poet: Honourable to the Emperour, whom he derives from a Divine Extraction; and reflecting part of that Honour on the *Roman* people, whom he derives from the *Trojans*'.[21] The Romantics rejected the adulation of Virgil (now Byron's 'miserable flatterer'), not the misreading.[22] By the late nineteenth century the description 'national epic' (Sellar: 'the *Aeneid* is the epic of national glory')[23] seemed almost standard for the *Aeneid* despite contemporary critical awareness of the poem's tragic dimension. The description did in fact prove canonical, its assumptions (and frequently the tag itself) prominent in the work of critics as diverse as Page (1894), Comparetti (1895), Heinze (1915), Cartault (1926), Prescott (1927), Bowra (1939), Graves (1962), Williams (1967), McKay (1970), Gransden (1976). Nor only in the work of critics:

> No, Vergil, no:
>   Not even the first of the Romans can learn
> His Roman history in the future tense,
>   Not even to serve your political turn;
> Hindsight as foresight makes no sense.
>
> (W.H. Auden, 'Secondary Epic', 1960)

Ironically scholarship shored up error. An increased preoccupation (evident from Sellar onwards) both with the Roman epic-panegyric tradition and with

---

[17] *In Verg. Aen. i. Praef.*

[18] See D. Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages* (trans. E. F. M. Benecke, London 1908, rep. 1966) 181 n. 19.

[19] Not to mention interpretive woodcuts (e.g. Sebastian Brant's Strasbourg editions) or the addition of Maffeo Veggio's *Aeneid* 13.

[20] For example, Tasso (1594): 'Abbia ancora risguardo il poeta a la gloria de la nazione, a l'origine de la città et de le famiglie illustri, a' principi de' regni e de gl'imperi, come ebbe oltre a tutti gli altri Virgilio', *Discorsi del poema eroico, Libro secondo*, in *Torquato Tasso Prose*, a cura di Ettore Mazzali (Milan/Naples 1959) 554.

[21] J. Dryden, 'The Dedication of the Aeneis', in *The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. J. Kinsley (Oxford 1958) 1015.

[22] For other reasons behind the 'Romantic rejection' of Virgil, see R. D. Williams, 'Changing Attitudes to Virgil', in D. R. Dudley (ed.), *Virgil* (London 1969) 119-38, esp. 128-33.

[23] W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil* (3rd ed., Oxford 1897) 324.

the 'panegyrical' proem to the third georgic served to underscore the *Aeneid*'s status as 'national epic'. Even Otis fell victim. But if one thing seems indisputable about *Georgic* 3's proem, it is that the epic which Virgil there imagines writing in glorification of Caesar's 'burning battles' (*ardentis pugnas*, *G.* 3.46), the epic which, as the quotation from Ennius in line 9 of the proem and the allusions to Pindar through the metaphors of chariot and temple (*G.* 3.13ff.) suggest, was to be Roman, historical and panegyrical, is precisely not the *Aeneid*. *Georgic* 3's poetic *templum* was never built.

But if semiological complexity and generic misreading have been factors in the failure of Virgil's text, so too has been the uncritical use of biographical and historical postulates. All too frequently Virgil's life (its details generally derived from the amalgam of myth, conjecture and fact [?] in the Suetonius-Donatus *Vita*) and the historical context in which he wrote have been taken as the data to which his texts have had to be accommodated. Hypotheses about the social and political climate in Rome during the 40s, 30s and 20s B.C., in particular about the contemporary (especially Virgilian) attitude to Caesar Octavian/Augustus, to his political methods, objectives, achievements, have often been allowed to function as fact, preforming interpretation of a given Virgilian text. Unsubstantiated allusions to Virgil's 'patriotic and personal feeling to the saviour of the State' (Sellar)[24] or to his 'pride' in Rome's 'imperial greatness' (Page)[25] are prominent in both nineteenth and twentieth century criticism. Prescott (1927) exemplifies: 'A great crisis, a great leader, a national need, prompted Virgil to exercise a high function of the poet, service to the state'.[26] Even as recently as 1969 Camps could curiously exclaim: 'There was every reason why he [Virgil] should admire the splendour of Rome's achievement'.[27] The retort, 'There was also every reason why he should not', labours the obvious, but an obvious often ignored. Indeed despite the critical re-evaluation of the so-called 'Augustan achievement' generated by the brilliant work of Ronald Syme,[28] the influence of the traditional pro-Augustan hypotheses still manifests itself in contemporary criticism. Du Quesnay (1981), for example, on the matter of Augustan 'pessimism': 'It serves the Augustan writers as a stick, as their "utopianism"serves them as a carrot (to put it crudely), in order to persuade their readers that their only hope of salvation (but that is a very real hope) lies in the acceptance of Augustus Caesar'.[29] Or Williams (1977) — one

---

[24] *Ibid.* 297.

[25] T.E. Page (ed.), *Virgil: Aeneid I-VI* (London 1894) xx.

[26] H.W. Prescott, *The Development of Virgil's Art* (Chicago 1927, rep. New York 1963) 151.

[27] W.A. Camps, *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1969) 2.

[28] R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939). A recent essay which throws some light on anti-Augustan feeling in the 20s is that of B. Levick, 'Primus, Murena and *Fides*: Notes on Cassius Dio liv. 3', *G&R* n.s. 22 (1975) 156-63.

[29] I.M. Du Quesnay, *G&R* n.s. 28 (1981) 97.

of the most sensitive commentators on Virgil's poetry and language — on post-Actium 'optimism': 'Hopes were high that Rome could now recall her ancient virtues and enter under Augustus upon a new Golden Age: and it was in these hopes that Virgil wrote his epic'.[30] Echoes perhaps of Dante's Virgilio: *vissi a Roma sotto 'l buono Augusto* (*Inferno* 1.71).[31] But Dante had more excuse.

What is at fault here is not simply an error in historical judgment but one in critical method, derived in part from simplification of the relationship between history and text. Product (necessarily) of a historical context, a text's relationship with that context is yet energic, dynamic; and determination of a text's meaning is among other things a scrutiny of that dynamic relationship, of a text's creative interplay with its own historical moment. Critical primacy must be accorded text and not context because it is only in the text that the creative use and placement of the historical context exists. The text's ontological primacy similarly dictates. Present in determinate actuality before the reader in a way the historical context is not, the text can be experienced, felt into, possessed. Indeed, unless experienced, it necessarily fails; unless significantly understood, possessed, it remains despite its readers essentially a text unread. Reduction of text to context inverts critical and ontological primacies, aborts the critic's task.

Text and Critic

Not all would agree. The critic's task, goal, methods, function, are contemporarily in dispute. The last two decades especially have been ones of innovation, controversy and dissonance in literary studies, which succeeding explosions in literary theory have left a battle-field of conflicting ideologies and methods. Historicists search in E.D. Hirsch fashion[32] for historical meaning, rooted in historical circumstance, especially the circumstance of authorial intention and contemporary response; genericists attend to the literary imperatives of genre, the interrelated dictates of subject, mode and kind; mythologists seek archetypal patterns beneath surface structure, the universal symbolism of motif and form; comparatists stress transcultural commonalities of style and theme. Diversity, plurality, dissidence reign. There is little consensus, no common pursuit. Even modern psychoanalytic theory claims its committed adherents, who turn to Freud and the unconscious or to Heidegger and existentialism for models of coherence and intelligibility in the battle to construe texts. Semiotic

[30] R. D. Williams, *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Sydney 1977) 9.

[31] This of course is no chance remark. For Dante's view that the Roman empire had been sanctioned by God, see *Epistola* 7.410, *Convivio* 4.4, *Monarchia* 2.7.338; and J. H. Whitfield, 'Virgil into Dante', in Dudley [22] 94-118, esp. 96-110.

[32] E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven and London 1967), *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago and London 1976).

and culturalist strategies abound. As do Marxist critiques of literature as ideological product.

Nor is this to mention the traditional philological approach to text, which until recently defined classical literary scholarship. Much has been said about the deficiencies of the philological method. Its concentration on linguistic and grammatical peculiarities, on metrics, on *purpurei panni*, on surface narrativity, its false historicism and literary naivety, have all been commented upon at length in the 'new critical' work of the last twenty-five years. Its focus on text was, however, admirable, and sets it apart from more recent quasi-scientific strategies, which, often illuminating in an ancillary sense, tend to draw attention away from the irreducible singularity of text towards generic, thematic, semiotic, structural, stylistic and contextual commonalities, which seem little related to the main objectives of criticism. For — in the present writer's view — the critic's prime business remains unchanged: the analysis, exegesis and interpretation of literary works in their determinate particularity, Blake's 'Minute Particulars Organized'.[33] Nothing has happened as a result of the recent methodological ferment to alter this as the central critical task. When we read the *Aeneid*, enter into the *Aeneid*, experience, possess the *Aeneid* (in the important sense of 'possess'), we read, enter into, experience, possess not simply a historical document or cultural product or system of words or signs or analysis of human thought and behaviour nor even a poem or an epic, but this historical document, this cultural product, this verbal system, this 'fabric of signs',[34] this analysis of behaviour, this poem, this epic — and furthermore this epic qua *this* epic. The 'thisness' is cardinal: this history, this culture, this language, these signs, these behavioural models, these literary forms and conventions — ordered *thus*. A complex and comprehensive array of skills, approaches, methods, 'knowledges' — analytic, linguistic, historical, 'literary', cultural — is dictated by the complex nature (a complexity difficult to overestimate and not to be confused with elusiveness) of the literary work. One needs clear-sighted vision, not blinkers, an apparatus as flexible and subtle as possible. But the thrust of the apparatus must (the 'must' is one of necessity as much as of desire) be centripetal, towards and into, not away from, text. Text must be given the closest scrutiny in respect of language, imagery, structures and design, thought, values, perceptions, if the work's defining particularity, its literary and human distinctiveness, its 'thisness', is to be understood and possessed. *This* text, *this* work, *this* language ordered *thus*, to investigate which remains criticism's prime task.

Recent Virgilian criticism accords. The last three decades in fact have witnessed a series of detailed, analytic studies of individual Virgilian texts

[33] William Blake, *Jerusalem* 4.91.

[34] *Tissu de signes*, Derrida [1] 26.

and two major critiques of the Virgilian *œuvre*[35] devoted to the task of understanding the intricate particularities of Virgil's works and displaying the close scrutiny of text which the task demands. These studies have substantially transformed the Virgilian critical landscape and to them the present book is indebted beyond measure. Despite such studies, however, generic and 'historical' misreadings of Virgil still occur, and even in the studies themselves major omissions and deficiencies reveal themselves amid work otherwise sensitive, intelligent, profound. Most surprising perhaps has been the paucity of attention paid to the internal intertextuality of the Virgilian *œuvre*. Surprising, because there have been few poets as overtly self-conscious as Virgil about the interreferentiality of his texts. Thus the *Georgics* ends:

illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope, studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

(*G*. 4.563-66)

At that time I, Virgil, was nourished by sweet Parthenope,
Blossoming in the pursuits of inglorious peace,
I who played shepherd's songs and enboldened by youth,
Tityrus, sang of you beneath spread of sheltering beech.

With intentional echo of the first line of the *Eclogues* book:

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi.

(*E*. 1.1)

Tityrus, you lie beneath spread of sheltering beech.

Thus the *Aeneid* ends:

uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

(*A*. 12.952)

With a groan life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

With intentional echo, it seems, of the chorus of 'shadows' that close Virgil's first text —

surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.

(*E*. 10.75f.)

Let us rise: shade is oppressive to singers;
Juniper shade's oppressive; crops too are stunted by shadows.

---

[35] I mean of course those of Otis [12] and F. Klingner, *Virgil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* (Zürich 1967). To these should be added Michael Putnam's separate studies of the Virgilian works — *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass. 1966), *Virgil's Pastoral Art* (Princeton 1970) and *Virgil's Poem of the Earth* (Princeton 1979) — each of major importance.

— and of the 'shadows' that begin (*in umbra*, *E.* 1.4) and end (*umbrae*, *E.* 1.83) that text's first poem. Internal intertextuality is in fact a prime Virgilian mode, the three texts being in a sense a single text, a complex, interwoven whole, a continuous, evolving, self-reflexive meditation in which the end and the beginning are one. What Virgil demands is not simply close, holistic scrutiny of each of the three texts (although he does demand that). He demands holistic scrutiny of the *œuvre*. The Virgilian critic must address the totality of the Virgilian text.

Text and World

Text unread, text misread, is text failed. But text understood, experienced, is not necessarily text successful. Indeed there are those who maintain that a text understood necessarily fails:

> On pourrait dire, je crois, que la littérature, c'est Orphée remontant des enfers; tant qu'elle va devant soi, *sachant cependant qu'elle conduit quelqu'un*, le réel qui est derrière elle et qu'elle tire peu à peu de l'innommé, respire, marche, vit, se dirige vers la clarté d'un sens; mais sitôt qu'elle se retourne sur ce qu'elle aime, il ne reste plus entre ses mains qu'un sens nommé, c'est-à-dire un sens mort.
>
> (R. Barthes, *Tel Quel*, 1963)[36]

For Virgil semantic closure is not a defect, more a *telos*. His pessimism about the failure of even the comprehended text centres not on the necessarily excluding nature of the perception of meaning, but on the gap between text understood and human action.

> sic ait atque animum pictura pascit inani
> multa gemens.
>
> (*A.* 1.464f.)
>
> So he speaks and feeds his soul on the futile picture
> Heavily sighing.

Text, picture, image may communicate meaning, emotion, understanding, but in the area of human action and history change substantially nothing. Product, index and critique of contemporary Rome as Virgil's poetic *œuvre* is, its inability to effect and to change, its historical impotence in the face of larger, more compelling forces make it, even understood, still *un texte manqué*: 'baffled effort' (*studio inani*, *E.* 2.5), 'wasted toil' (*effusus labor*, *G.* 4.492), 'futile image' (*pictura inani*, *A.* 1.464). But, while perhaps — as Aristotle observed (*EN.* 1139a35) — thought, intelligence, knowledge move nothing, political, military and psychological violence do:

[36] Reprinted in R. Barthes, *Essais Critiques* (Paris 1964) 265.

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

(*E.* 9.11-13)

But our songs
Have as much strength, Lycidas, among the spears of Mars
As, they say, have Chaonian doves when the eagle comes.

hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
feruidus. ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

(*A.* 12.950-52)

So saying he buries the steel full in Turnus' breast
Burning. The other's limbs are loosened with cold;
With a groan life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

Even understood, the Chaonian dove's *carmina* may move little. *Exemplum* of poetry's didactic and moral impotence, Virgil's failed text in this sense signals too a failed world.

The following studies address themselves to the understanding of Virgil's text. They make little attempt to mitigate its failure in the area of text and world. The relentless dialectic generated by the three texts between poetic ideal and contemporary fact, between poetry's or art's didactic function and history's impenetrable texture, between the artist's values or vision and the political, historical and psychological forces that shape the human world, permits no sanguineity on the issue of the intellect's power, its ability to efform and to effect. Between analysis, understanding, knowledge and vision, on the one hand, and action, behaviour, event and world, on the other, there are, as the *Aeneid* shows, a river of forgetfulness and a gate made of ivory. Rome's greatest poet and the last two millenia of European history have at least taught us that.

CHAPTER TWO

PASTORAL MEDITATION: THE *ECLOGUES*

Pastoral is a contemplative form. Created in the midst of social turmoil and political convulsion, the *Eclogues* constitute a meditation on the emotional, intellectual and moral dislocation of contemporary man. They investigate not only the brute historical fact of the destructive impact of the politico-military world — the world of the city, of Rome — upon the country, but also the psychological chaos and spiritual impoverishment which Virgil sees as the city's legacy and the corollary of technological growth. And within the context of a world dominated by urban values they scrutinise the question of poetry's function and efficacy. They present, in short, a poetic analysis of postlapsarian man measured against the yardstick of his finest ideals and, concomitant with this, a statement of poetry's impotence.

City and Country

Eclogues 1 and 9 contain a transparent, severe depiction of havoc, dissolution and suffering generated in the rural world by the violence and will of the city. The upheaval and devastation apparent in field and flock are emphasised in both poems (see, e.g., *E.* 1.1-5, 11-15; *E.* 9.1-10) and the dislocation and suffering experienced by the herdsmen themselves (and note how in *E.* 1 Meliboeus is made to be typical of the countrymen at large — *Tityre, tu ... nos ... nos ... tu, Tityre*, 'Tityrus, you ... we ... we ... you, Tityrus', *E.* 1.1-4; *undique totis/usque adeo turbatur agris. en ipse ...* 'everywhere the whole land / is in such turmoil. Look how I ... ', *E.* 1.11-12) are similarly underscored (see, e.g., E. 1.1-5, 11-13, 64-78; *E.* 9.2-6, 11-20, 51-54). The destruction is pointedly immense; it affects the rural world in all its dimensions — natural, animal and human. Its source is the city, the arbitrary and menacing power of which dominates each of these eclogues, most dramatically the opening of the ninth:

L. Quo te, Moeri, pedes? an, quo uia ducit, in urbem?
M. O Lycida, uiui peruenimus, aduena nostri
(quod numquam ueriti sumus) ut possessor agelli
diceret: 'haec mea sunt; ueteres migrate coloni'.
nunc uicti, tristes, quoniam fors omnia uersat,
hos illi (quod nec uertat bene) mittimus haedos.

(*E.* 9.1-6)

L. Where are you off to, Moeris? Where the road leads, to the city?
M. O Lycidas, that we've lived to hear a stranger —

Something we never feared — our farmlet's possessor! —
Say: 'This property is mine; move elsewhere, old tenants'.
Now, crushed, distressed, since chance turns all things about,
We send — and may it turn out badly — these kids to him.[1]

This carefully delineated, desolating conflict of city and country, urban world and rural life, is foreign to Theocritean pastoral,[2] and its conspicuous presence in the initial and penultimate eclogues articulates a crucial difference between Virgil's bucolics and those of his Alexandrian predecessor. The difference is not superficial. Virgil's concern with the city-country polarity is of the most far-reaching kind. He is concerned with the historical fact of physical violence, geographical displacement, and human misery (the land-confiscations of 41 B.C. are patently in mind). But he is concerned also to extend his analysis of contemporary rural affliction to the larger and more disturbing issue of the moral and intellectual impoverishment which the triumph of city over country, of 'civilised', technological man over 'uncivilised', natural man, has engendered. The rural or pastoral world becomes in Virgil's hands a mirror of Rome's distress, a looking-glass in which the constitutive features of contemporary experience are seen against a background of lost ideals and forgotten aspirations. Thus in *Eclogue* 9, Virgil's 'Thalysia in reverse',[3] urban man's assault upon song and the creative power and created world of the singer (see, e.g., *E.* 9.11-20, 51-54) is given sharp, evaluative definition through the interlacing of its description with overt, emotive allusions to an ideal Theocritean past of uninhibited song, joyous simplicity, natural bounty and innocence (*E.* 9.21-25, 39-43 — represented as a 'recent' past: *nuper*, *E.* 9.21) and through the eclogue's pervasive, covert allusions to the creative, fruitful, harmonious world of Theocritus' seventh idyll, the 'Thalysia', the motifs, themes and atmosphere of which the ninth eclogue systematically inverts.[4] Similarly in *Eclogue* 1 the moral insensibility of the 'pliant' (*lentus*, *E.* 1.4), *urbs*-praising Tityrus, who responds to Meliboeus' plight with neither compassion nor understanding (see especially the alleged *adynata* or 'impossibilities' catalogued by Tityrus at *E.* 1.59-62, each of which is clearly and painfully actualised before.his eyes in the experience of Meliboeus),[5] who talks glibly of

---

[1] The translations in this chapter are from my *The Eclogues of Virgil*, translated with introduction, notes and Latin text (Melbourne 1976).

[2] Despite Gilbert Lawall, *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book* (Washington D.C. 1967), esp. 14-33.

[3] The phrase is that of W. Berg, *Early Virgil* (London 1974) 138.

[4] For specific allusions to *Id.* 7 *cf. E.* 9.1, 32-36, 41-42, 59-60 with *Id.* 7.21, 37-41, 7-9, 10-11 respectively.

[5] See Michael Putnam's penetrating account, *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues* (Princeton N.J. 1970) 51-55. Putnam concludes (55): 'By his use of these analogies Tityrus betrays little or no comprehension of what is afflicting mankind ... while confirming Meliboeus' sketch of his idyllic state, [he] has made no attempt to understand, much less sympathize with the lot of

sacrificing a 'gentle lamb' (*tener agnus*, *E.* 1.8) from his sheepfolds to his urban god,[6] who speaks at times with the artificial or distorted syntax of the city (see, e.g., *E.* 1.27-30, 59-63),[7] who displays little affection for the rural world and exhibits no awareness of the implications of the dependency of his exclusive 'peace', his private *otium* (*E.* 1.6), upon an external, violent and arbitrary force, is presented with stringent, judgmental clarity through the persistent contrast (a contrast around which the structure of the poem is built) with the concern and humanity of the dispossessed Meliboeus, whose personal tragedy reveals a deep love of the land and its creatures, whose values and whose songs the pastoral world sorely needs, but who is driven from the borders and pastures of his homeland only to leave field and song to Tityrus and the 'godless soldier' (*E.* 1.1-5, 11-15, 46-58, 64-78):

at nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros,
pars Scythiam et rapidum cretae ueniemus Oaxen
et penitus toto diuisos orbe Britannos.
en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen,
post aliquot, mea regna, uidens mirabor aristas?
impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit,
barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia ciuis
produxit miseros: his nos conseuimus agros.
insere nunc, Meliboee, piros, pone ordine uitis.
ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae.
non ego uos posthac uiridi proiectus in antro
dumosa pendere procul de rupe uidebo.

Meliboeus. He betrays no knowledge of suffering'. It is of course true that Tityrus' final words to Meliboeus (1.79-83) are an invitation to the goatherd to share his partoral pleasance for the night. The invitation, however, despite R. Coleman, 'Pastoral Poetry', in J. Higginbotham (ed.), *Greek and Latin Literature: A Comparative Study* (London 1969) 120, D. E. W. Wormell, 'The Originality of the Eclogues', in D. R. Dudley (ed.), *Virgil* (London 1969) 18, and Putnam, *op. cit.* 64 ff., is singularly inept: (a) It comes too late — Meliboeus has started to move off at *E.* 1.74, and *poteras* (*E.* 1.79), which, as R. Coleman later points out in his *Vergil: Eclogues* (Cambridge 1977) *ad loc.* 'properly implies an unreal condition', seems naturally to have the sense, 'you could have' (*cf.* Cicero *Fam.* 1.7.7; Ovid *Met.* 1.621); (b) It displays no appreciation of the total dislocation experienced by Meliboeus, but merely draws attention, as ever, to Tityrus' own 'fortunate' situation. The judgment of B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964) 132, that 'in the end the natural spleen of Meliboeus is assuaged by the hospitality of Tityrus' has no foundation in the text. E. W. Leach, *Vergil's Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience* (Ithaca and London 1974) 117, rightly sees 'no synthesis', 'no reconciliation', at the end.

[6] If *E.* 1.6 and 42 are oblique references to Octavian, it would seem perverse to construe them as eulogistic, as has been the practice of commentators from Servius onwards. For modern examples see Otis [5] 131 ff., who takes 'praise of Octavian' to be the main point of *E.* 1, the poem being a reaffirmation of Virgil's 'positive attitude toward the Julian *gens*', and also Wormell [5] 17, who describes *E.* 1 as 'Virgil's manifesto of allegiance to the new regime'.

[7] See C. P. Segal, '*Tamen cantabitis, Arcades*: Exile and Arcadia in Eclogues One and Nine', *Arion* 4 (1965) 242-43.

carmina nulla canam; non me pascente, capellae,
florentem cytisum et salices carpetis amaras.

(*E.* 1.64-78)

But we shall go from here to the thirsting Africans,
Some to Scythia and Oaxes' turbulent chalk,
And to Britain, utterly severed from all the world.
Ah, will I after long years ever see the borders
Of my homeland, my simple hut with turf-piled roof,
And gaze marvelling at my kingdom, a few ears of corn?
A godless soldier will hold these nurtured ploughlands,
A foreigner these crops. See where discord has led
Misfortunate citizens: for these men we sowed our fields.
Graft now, Meliboeus, your pear-trees, set vines in rows.
Onward, my little goats, once happy flock, onward.
Never again will I, stretched out in some green cave,
Spy you in the distance hanging from a brambly crag.
I shall sing no songs; not while I pasture you, my goats,
Will you crop flowering clover and bitter willows.

The contiguous laudation of Tityrus' divine benefactor (*E.* 1.59-63) — its sustained revelation of blinkered intellect and impoverished sensibility — is vigorously accented.

The first eclogue's indictment is specific, unambiguous and programmatic. As Tityrus' defunct sensibility and cognition disclose (and it is not accidental that he and the 'godless soldier', the *impius miles*, inherit the earth), arbitrary will and urban force transform the pastoral pleasance into a moral and intellectual desert. The impressive georgic command of Tityrus' young urban god (*pascite ut ante boues, pueri; summittite tauros*, 'Pasture cattle as before, children; breed your bulls', *E.* 1.45), fiercely parodied by Meliboeus in 73 (*insere nunc, Meliboee, piros, pone ordine uitis*, 'Graft now, Meliboeus, your pear-trees, set vines in rows')[8] and subverted in 77 (*non me pascente*, 'not while I pasture you'), is not only restricted; it restricts. It restricts emotionally, morally and intellectually. The *libertas* which it professes to bestow (*E.* 1.27) is a political mirage;[9] the 'woodland Muse' it 'allows' (*E.* 1.2.10) is the internal resonance (*resonare*, *E.* 1.5) of a spiritual wilderness.[10] Even the 'rustic reed' (*calamo agresti*, *E.* 1.10) is now a 'thin oat-straw' (*tenui auena*, *E.* 1.2).[11] In the

[8] Similarly the contrast between the experiential irony of this injunction and the georgic vision of *E.* 9.50 locates urban promises of rural fecundity and moral order as contrafactual verbal gesture.

[9] For *libertas* as a major political catchword of the 40s B.C. see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (2nd imp. Oxford 1952) 154-55. It was used by Caesar as the justification for his initial march on Rome in 49 B.C.: *BC* 1.22.5.

[10] On the 'echoic', trivial quality of Tityrus' *siluestris Musa* ('woodland Muse', *E.* 1.2) see A.J. Boyle, 'Virgil's Pastoral Echo', *Ramus* 6 (1977) 121-31, esp. 121 f.

[11] See Leach [5] 118, and J. Van Sickle, 'Studies of Dialectical Methodology in the Virgilian Tradition', *MLN* 85 (1970) esp. 893-96, who see the *auena* as an 'unpromising poetic tool', as opposed to the reed (*calamus*, *harundo*), possibly 'one that really works'. Leach interestingly

paradigm of Tityrus Rome's affinity with the tree of death (*E.* 1.24-25) has more than physical import.[12]

The pastoral world as such in the *Eclogues* is both real and symbolic. It is both the rural environment of contemporary Italy, subject to the will and oppression of the city, Rome, and a moral, psychological and intellectual landscape, an image both of man's ideals (as in *E.* 4 and 5) and of the reality of their non-fulfilment (as in *E.* 1-3, 7-10). The latter point is crucial and widely misunderstood. The pastoral world of the *Eclogues* is no spiritual paradise.[13] The values which Virgil places at the centre of his pastoral vision — peace, love, friendship, nurture, mutual respect, joy, compassion, innocence, poetic creativity and efficacy, spiritual tranquillity, a fecund harmony between man and man and between man and nature celebrated paradigmatically in song — to which the poet draws express and emphatic attention (see, e.g., *E.* 2.28-55; *E.* 3.55-57; *E.* 5 *passim*)[14] set up an ideal which in most of the eclogues is patently unrealised. If the *Eclogues* draw attention to a paradise, it is a paradise already lost.

Discord and Love

The triumph of urban values — power, wealth, ambition, greed, the manic passion for war — manifested in the distemper of contemporary Rome,

---

comments (118 n. 7): 'Mr. Van Sickle has demonstrated the point quite cogently by presenting me with an actual oaten straw, a slender stalk about one-quarter inch in diameter, quite useless for producing any variety or modulation of sound'. Though Leach seems to overstate the case when she remarks (118) that 'The *tenuis auena* implies that music is a trivial occupation for such a critical time', it certainly seems to imply that Tityrus' music is. Coleman [5, *Vergil: Eclogues*] *ad E.* 1.2 attempts bravely to interpret *auena* generically but seems selfconsciously unpersuasive.

[12] It is fine and telling irony that it is the 'pliant' (*lentus, E.* 1.4) Tityrus who compares the rise of Rome to that of the cypress (the tree of death) among 'pliant' (*lenta, E.* 1.25) osiers.

[13] As Bruno Snell would have it in *The Discovery of the Mind* (trans. Rosenmeyer, rep. New York 1960) 281-309.

[14] Most effective in this regard is the use of 'joining' imagery and phrases to suggest values which unite rather than separate — 'community', rural values as opposed to 'individualistic', urban ones: *E.* 2.28-55: *mecum* ('with me', 28), *compellere* ('drive together', 30), *mecum una* ('with me beside you', 31), *coniungere* ('unite', 32), *disparibus septem compacta cicutis* ('constructed from seven unequal stalks', 36), *iungit* ('joins', 48), *intexens* ('weaving', 49), *addam* ('add', 53), *miscetis* ('mingle', 55); *E.* 3.55: *consedimus* ('sat together'); and esp. the opening of *E.* 5:

cur non, Mopse, boni quoniam conuenimus ambo,
tu calamos inflare leuis, ego dicere uersus,
hic corylis mixtas inter consedimus ulmos? (*E.* 5.1-3)

Why not, Mopsus, since we have met, good men both,
You at sounding the light reeds, I at singing verses,
Sit together here where elms mingle with the hazels?

Carlotta Griffith's remarks in 'Myricae', *PVS* 9 (1969-70) 17, are worthy of attention: 'I think that one of the reasons why Virgil chose to write pastoral was that the convention it provided was tied to no one place or time, to no one individual or story, but to the idea of a *community*, the community of shepherds. No other genre could offer such a thing'. (My italics).

underscored dramatically and most particularly in *Eclogues* 1 and 9,[15] is reflected throughout the *Eclogues* book in the internal discord of the pastoral world itself, in the pastoral world's loss of a prelapsarian harmony between man, nature and man. In the song of Silenus in *Eclogue* 6 Virgil, qua moral Callimachus, explicitly presents the dissolution of this pristine concord between humankind and nature as the *aition* or 'cause' of man's spiritual dislocation:

> hinc lapides Pyrrhae iactos, Saturnia regna,
> Caucasiasque refert uolucris furtumque Promethei.
> his adiungit, Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum
> clamassent, ut litus 'Hyla, Hyla' omne sonaret.
> et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent,
> Pasiphaën niuei solatur amore iuuenci.
> a, uirgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit?
>
> (*E.* 6.41-47)
>
> Next he relates the stones cast by Pyrrha, Saturn's reign,
> The Caucasian birds and theft of Prometheus.
> To these he links the spring where sailors called for Hylas
> Left behind, till the whole shore rang 'Hylas! Hylas!'
> And Pasiphaë — fortunate, if cattle hadn't existed —
> He consoles in her love for the snowy bull.
> Ah, hapless girl, what derangement has seized you?

The preceding part of Silenus' song (*E.* 6.31-40) had focussed on the creation of an ordered and shaped natural world out of disorder and shapelessness. Then in two of the most important lines of the *Eclogues* Silenus narrates the birth of man from nature itself (the Pyrrha myth, 41), man's initial period of paradisical harmony with god and nature (*Saturnia regna*, 'Saturn's reign', 41), and his subsequent fall, viz., the disintegration of the original communion between man, god and nature consequent upon Prometheus' theft of fire (the 'primal deceit', *prisca fraus*, of *E.* 4.31) and the rise of technological man (42).[16] The ensuing myths — excepting the episode at 64-73 concerned with Gallus' poetic metamorphosis and with the role of the poet-teacher in restoring the right relationship between man, god and nature[17] — provide illustrations of human suffering and spiritual discord associated with (*his adiungit*, 'To these he links',

---

[15] *Cf.* the fierce attack on 'urban' values in the finale to *Georgic* 2 (esp. 458-65, 495-512). See further below pp. 56 ff.

[16] The Pyrrha myth is misinterpreted by Otis [5] 138 as representing a 'Flood and Second Creation' following the 'Fall'. Such a view (a) ignores the fact that *in that case* there is no first creation of man, and (b) makes nonsense of the position of the myth immediately *after* the creation of the natural world and immediately *before* the *Saturnia regna*, after which comes man's Promethean fall. Correctly, however, Otis is dissatisfied with the 'neoteric catalogue' interpretation of the myths: 'None of these theories ... accounts for the order and continuity of the Silenus song as a whole' (137 n. 1). Unfortunately neither does Otis' own theory.

[17] On Gallus' poetic metamorphosis in *E.* 6 see Putnam [5] 211-15.

43) and issuing from the dissolution of this earlier pastoral harmony, and conjoined appropriately (in a manner reminiscent of the epilogue to Catullus 64)[18] with man's offences against gods, physical nature and kin, with humanity's disregard of divine and natural law. The myth of man's generation from stones cast in the earth, used anachronistically and purposefully by Virgil, emphasises, like the metamorphosis motif which pervades the song itself, the continuity between man and his natural environment, the interpenetration of man and nature, which myth, history and contemporary experience show man's behaviour to ignore. Spiritual discord is both symptom and consequence of dissociation from a natural environment to which man is bound by ties as strong as those which link him to the immediate origins of his flesh. And discord's prime manifestation (*E.* 6.45-60, 74-81): the perversion of the cardinal value of the pastoral ideal, love.

> et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent,
> Pasiphaën niuei solatur amore iuuenci.
> a, uirgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit?
> Proetides implerunt falsis mugitibus agros;
> at non tam turpis pecudum tamen ulla secuta
> concubitus, quamuis collo timuisset aratrum
> et saepe in leui quaesisset cornua fronte.
> a, uirgo infelix, ...
>
> (*E.* 6.45-52)

> And Pasiphaë — fortunate, if cattle hadn't existed —
> He consoles in her love for the snowy bull.
> Ah, hapless girl, what derangement has seized you?
> Proetus' daughters filled the fields with imitation-lowings;
> Yet not one pursued such foul copulation
> With the herd, however much each feared the plough
> On her neck and often felt for horns on smooth brow.
> Ah, hapless girl, ...

Love is a dominant, pervasive, ambivalent motif in the *Eclogues.* The love which constitutes the cardinal value of Virgil's pastoral ideal is unequivocally not sexual passion. In the *Eclogues* sexual passion (the influence of Lucretius is plain) is turbulent, disorienting, uncontrollable and manic. As experienced by Corydon in *Eclogue* 2, Pasiphaë in *Eclogue* 6, the protagonists of the songs of *Eclogue* 8, Gallus in *Eclogue* 10, it is a 'derangement' (*dementia, E.* 2.69; *E.* 6.47), 'frenzy' (*furor, E.* 10.38, 60), 'madness' (*insanis, E.* 10.22), which has no limit (*E.* 2.68; *E.* 10.28), seizes (*E.* 2.69; *E.* 6.47), burns (*E.* 2.68; *E.* 8.83), deceives (*E.* 8,18,91), distresses (*E.* 2.58; *E.* 6.47, 52; *E.* 10.6), conquers (*E.* 10.69) and is 'unworthy' (*indigno, E.* 8.18; *E.* 10.10). What Virgil locates at the

[18] The influence of this famous poem is not restricted to *E.* 4 (for which see n. 23 below). Catullus' indictment of contemporary Rome (64.397ff.) is on two interrelated grounds: contempt for the gods and crimes against kin.

centre of his pastoral vision is the antithesis of this: creative, not destructive, allied to friendship, to a sense of inherent worth, it is a calm, abiding, compassionate, intellectual, spiritual love of man for man, creature and nature, and for such products of the union of man and nature as peace, simplicity, innocence, poetry, song, joy, natural bounty, and love itself, which are in the poet's eyes the celebration of that union. Such love is exhibited in Meliboeus' affection for herd and farm in *Eclogue* 1, in Damoetas' gift to Corydon in *Eclogue* 2 (36-38), in Pollio's love of the rustic muse and in the love for Pollio and his ideals in *Eclogue* 3 (83 and 88), in the smile of the heavenly child for his mother in *Eclogue* 4 (60-63),[19] in Daphnis' love of peace, his love of Mopsus and Menalcas and in the singers' mutual harmony and friendship in *Eclogue* 5 (esp. 1-3, 52, 61, 85-90), in the compassion of Silenus in *Eclogue* 6 (esp. 45-47, 78-81), in Corydon's love of the nymphs in *Eclogue* 7 (21), in Menalcas' concern for the land in *Eclogue* 9, in Virgil's love of Gallus in *Eclogue* 10 (73-74). The frenzied, irrational, deforming, 'unworthy' sexual love of Corydon in *Eclogue* 2, Pasiphae in *Eclogue* 6, the protagonists of the songs in *Eclogue* 8, Gallus in *Eclogue* 10, is the perversion of this ideal: the emotionality of man run wild. It generates pain, suffering, debasement, fragmentation and dissolution; it produces a tragic alienation from the norms and values of the pastoral world (see esp. *E.* 2.8-13, 66-72; *E.* 6.52; *E.* 8.52-58; *E.* 10.62-63). It provides a potent demonstration of spiritual sickness, the ramifications of which for Rome in the 40s B.C. are evident. Its psychological and moral twin is man's passion for the hard god of war (*E.* 10.44-45).

Not that alienation, pastoral discord or manic passion forms the theme of each eclogue. On the contrary the ideal visions of *Eclogues* 4 and 5 portray a world transformed by pastoral values into a natural and spiritual paradise. In the 'Messianic' eclogue Virgil goes back via Catullus to the Hesiodic, non-Theocritean notion of a golden age, a prelapsarian era of innocence, peace, justice, natural bounty and love, for an image of the spiritual rebirth of contemporary Rome for which he and others longed; while in *Eclogue* 5 he depicts his ideal of human achievement — the generation through a nourishing and augmenting love of a fecund, joyous and revitalising union of man, god and nature:

candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi
sub pedibusque uidet nubes et sidera Daphnis.
ergo alacris siluas et cetera rura uoluptas

[19] The contrast between ideal familial love at the end of *E.* 4 (60-63) and the sexually motivated disregard of the laws of kin in the concluding part of Silenus' song in *E.* 6 (74-81) seems clearly intended. The latter clarifies the Virgilian ideal by illustrating the heinous consequences of its postlapsarian negation.

Panaque pastoresque tenet Dryadasque puellas.
nec lupus insidias pecori, nec retia ceruis
ulla dolum meditantur: amat bonus otia Daphnis.
ipsi laetitia uoces ad sidera iactant
intonsi montes; ipsae iam carmina rupes,
ipsa sonant arbusta: 'deus, deus ille, Menalca!'

(*E.* 5.56-64)

Radiant, he marvels at the strange threshold of Olympus
And beneath his feet Daphnis sees the clouds and the stars.
At this a quickening joy grips forests and country fields
And Pan and the shepherds, too, and Dryad Nymphs.
No wolf contemplates an ambush for the flock,
No nets a snare for deer: good Daphnis loves peace.
Even the shaggy hills fling with delight their voices
To the stars; now even the crags, even copses
Ring with song: 'A god, a god, he is, Menalcas!'

The echo of Lucretius (*deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi*, 'A god he was, a god, renowned Memmius', *DRN* 5.8) is unmistakable (*cf.* also *E.* 1. 6-7) and suggestive. Like that of Epicurus, the achievement of Daphnis lies in the area of spiritual rebirth.

The idealism of *Eclogues* 4 and 5, however, is both patent and self-conscious.[20] Their social and moral optimism is intentionally undermined by the pastoral discord of the encompassing eclogues, which highlight the gap between the ideals of these central poems and the actuality of postlapsarian and contemporary experience.[21] The prophecy of *Eclogue* 4 is essentially a didactic vision, a sustained imagistic plea by Virgil, the poet-teacher,[22] for an

[20] The fragile quality of the idealism of *E.* 5 seems to be suggested within the poem itself: (a) by the initial focus upon the venue for the songs — the protected environment of a cave as opposed to the 'restless shadows' (*incertas umbras*) outside it (*E.* 5.1-7, 19); (b) by the concluding focus upon the fragility of Menalcas' (= Virgil's) poetic pipe (*fragili cicuta*, 'fragile stalk', *E.* 5.85).

[21] Some points of detail deserve mention: (a) The bitterly ironic employment of the 'golden age' motif by the victim of 'unworthy love' (*indignus amor*) at *E.* 8.52ff.; (b) The contrast in *E.* 3 (i) between Palaemon's idealising description of man-nature concord at 55-57 and the human discord of the opening dialogue, (ii) between the 'golden age' ideal associated with Pollio at 88-89 and the menace, sickness, evil and obscurity prevalent in the singers' pastoral world (esp. 92-107); (c) The contrast between the spiritual impoverishment of Tityrus' 'god-engendered peace' in *E.* 1 (6ff.) and the spiritual richness of the 'god-engendered peace' of *E.* 5 (56ff.); (d) The disparity between the rural ideal conjoined with Caesar and Daphnis at *E.* 9.46-50 and the suffering and dislocation experienced by Moeris in *E.* 9 and by Meliboeus in *E.* 1 (*cf.* esp. *E.* 9.50 with *E.* 1.73). As has often been noted, the death and apotheosis theme of *E.* 5 could not have failed to remind the contemporary Roman reader of the recent death and apotheosis of Caesar. Contrary to what is habitually asserted (see, e.g., Otis [5] 140ff., Wormell [5] 16), this does not entail Caesarian panegyric on Virgil's part. It simply means that the Daphnis-ideal is intended to be a model against which Caesarian actuality is to be measured. *E.* 9 calculates the distance between the two.

[22] Note especially the hortatory tone of the ending of *E.* 4 with its 'five teaching, parainetic imperatives: *adgredere*! ['enter!', 48], *aspice*! ['look!', 50], *aspice*! ['look!', 52], *incipe*! ['begin!', 60], *incipe*! ['begin!', 62]' (J. Van Sickle, 'The Unnamed Child: A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue', *HSCP* 71 [1966] 350).

end to civil war (*sceleris nostri*, 'our sin', *E.* 4.13) and the urban values from which it stems (*E.* 4.31ff.), for a reversal of the moral turpitude of the immediate past, roundly condemned by Catullus,[23] and the beginning of a spiritual metamorphosis. It is a vision and a plea which the *Eclogues* book as a whole reveals as necessary and all but certainly futile. In effect *Eclogues* 4 and 5 measure contemporary society by the canon of what it is not.

Poetry and Power

One of the main ingredients of Virgil's disquiet is his scepticism about poetry's efficacy, about the power of the singer and the song to affect either society or the individual in history. *Eclogues* 6-10 are directed primarily to the exploration of this issue.

The prologue to *Eclogue* 6 (1-12) and the ensuing introduction to (13-26) and description of (27-86) Silenus' song, which illustrate and develop the first-person poetics of the prologue,[24] present in conjunction a statement of Virgil's poetic ideal, a dramatic, detailed apocalypse of the essential constituents of Virgil's ideal song. Analysis of *Eclogue* 6 indicates the following constitutive features of this ideal: controlled fineness and subtlety of style (the song must be 'lean-spun', *deductum*, *E.* 6.5);[25] creativity (*E.* 6.62-63), manifested in the poetic creation of a world, the poetic shaping of experience, the giving of poetic form to reality; empathy and compassion (*E.* 6.45-47, 78-81); the fertile union of Bacchus and Apollo, emotionality and thought, daimonic inspiration and controlling, ordering intellect (esp. *E.* 6.3-5, 11-12, 13-17, 18-26, 29, 66, 73, 82);[26] moral substantiality of subject-matter (the origin, for example, of

---

[23] Catullus 64 is by far the dominant literary influence on *E.* 4. With *E.* 4.6, 10, 13, 15f., 26f., 31, 32-36, 40f., 46f., 63, *cf.* respectively Catullus 64.397ff., 299f., 397, 348-86, 51, 294f., *passim* but esp. 1-30 and 343-70, 38-42, 327 *et al.*, *passim* but esp. 407f. Whereas the birth of Achilles in Catullus' poem betokens the end of the state of concord between gods and men (symbolised by the marriage of Peleus and Thetis) and the beginning of postlapsarian violence and suffering, the birth of the child in *E.* 4 betokens the imminent return of man's primal state of harmony with nature and god and — eventually — the cessation of avarice, greed and ambition, and the attendant passion for war. Virgil's ideal age is not, however, to be identified with that of Catullus' poem. The forthcoming era of *E.* 4 is portrayed as an improvement on Catullus' lost 'heroic' age (see esp. *E.* 4.31-39), which is converted by Virgil into a golden age proper.

[24] *Cf.* the relationship between prologue and ensuing song in *E.* 4. Certain specific connections between the prologue of *E.* 6 and Silenus' song are noteworthy: Apollo (3, 11, 29, 66, 73, 82); *deductum carmen* ('lean-spun song', 5) and *deducere* ('lead in lean-spun song', 71); *meditabor* ('I shall study', 8) and *meditante* ('studying', 82); *non iniussa* ('not unordered', 9) and *iussit* ('ordered', 83 and 86).

[25] The reference, as has often been observed, is to Callimachus' 'thin' or 'slender' Muse (*Aetia* fr. 1.24 Pf.), a finely crafted, low-key, non-expansive style, the antithesis of epic bombast (the 'high', 'full', 'fat' style).

[26] *Cf.* C. Segal, 'Vergil's Sixth Eclogue and the Problem of Evil', *TAPA* 100 (1969) 420, and Putnam [5] 201-3, 217-18, esp.: 'The poem as a whole is a fluctuation between — and ultimately a

human misery and spiritual turmoil in the disintegration of the fruitful concord between man, god and nature and the attendant triumph of technologico-urban values: *E.* 6.41ff.); power to transform the environment (*E.* 6. 27-30, 70-71), viz., power to teach, to fulfil poetry's didactic function.

This last constituent of the sixth eclogue's poetic ideal is undeniably its most fragile. It is also in many respects its most important; and as an overt pointer to the centrality of didactic efficacy in his poetic ideal Virgil locates at the paradigmatic core of his ideal the early Greek didactic poet, Hesiod.

ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor
floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro
dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,
Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos'.

(*E.* 6.67-71)

And [he sings] how Linus, the shepherd of divine song,
Hair garlanded with flowers and bitter celery,
Said to him [Gallus]: 'These reeds — take them — the Muses
give you,
Which once they gave the old Ascraean, who used them
To lead downhill in lean-spun song the rigid ash'.

Direct allusion to 'Ascraean' Hesiod renders Virgil's Hesiodic ideal transparent. It is also cardinal. Not only does Hesiod figure as the paradigm of both style and power (*deducere, E.* 6.71, has the sense both of 'leading down' and of 'using lean-spun song')[27] in the Gallus initiation scene of Silenus' song itself (and note the role of Hesiod's Heliconian initiation [*Theog.* 22ff.] as model for Gallus' own)[28] but in the revelatory prologue Virgil takes pains to cast his own poetic vocation in the Hesiodic as well as the Callimachean mould:

---

combination of — Dionysiac emotionality and Apolline order' (218). The significance of the binding-scene (*E.* 6.18-26) is transparent: Silenus' Bacchic inspiration and poetic energy have to be fettered, i.e., controlled, before he can produce the ideal *deductum carmen.* Not accidentally in the last line of the preceding eclogue (*E.* 5.90) the description of the shepherd's crook given to Menalcas as a reward for his song focusses on it, as even Servius *ad loc.* sees, as a construct of nature and artifice: *formosum paribus nodis atque aere* ('beautiful with its even knots and brass').

[27] Segal's suggestion [26] 421, that *deducere* has the connotation of 'removing them [the trees] from their natural setting', misses the connection with *deductum carmen* (*E.* 6.5) and seems curiously inappropriate.

[28] Callimachus' dream-encounter with the Hesiodic Muses (*Aetia* fr. 2 Pf.) also lies behind Gallus' initiation, underscoring its essentially Hesiodic form and providing a further link between the didactic idealism of Silenus' song and the poetics of the prologue. On Callimachus and *Eclogue* 6 see W. Clausen, 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry', *GRBS* 5 (1964) 194ff., whose statement, however — 'References to Hesiod in Virgil and Propertius are really references to Callimachus or his conception of Hesiod' (196) — seriously misleads. Virgil's Hesiodic allegiance was neither only nor primarily stylistic. The description of the *Georgics* as *Ascraeum carmen* ('Ascraean song', *G.* 2.176) is not simply a comment on the poem's style but a comment on its moral and didactic intent: see below pages 36 ff. Hesiod to Callimachus was simply an aesthetic ideal, to Virgil also a moral ideal.

prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu
nostra neque erubuit siluas habitare Thalea.
cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen'.
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam.

(*E.* 6.1.-8)

My first Muse saw fit to play in Syracusan verse,
And Thalea was not ashamed to inhabit the woods.
When I sang kings and battles, Cynthius plucked
My ear and warned: 'A shepherd's duty, Tityrus,
Is to feed his sheep fat, to keep his song lean-spun'.
Now I (for there'll be more than enough who desire,
Varus, to tell your praises and set doleful wars to verse)
Shall study the rustic Muse on a thin reed.

The reference to Hesiod's poetic initiation by the Muses, 'while *shepherding* lambs beneath holy Helicon' (*Theog.* 23), lies unconcealed amid Callimachean *mimesis* (*Aetia* fr. 1.21-24 Pf.).[29] Analogous references to Hesiod's Heliconian initiation at the end of *Eclogue* 5 (88)[30] and later in *Eclogue* 6 (64ff. — note the effective link: *deductum carmen, E.* 6.5, *deducere, E.* 6.71) and the obvious allusion to *Eclogue* 1 underline the meaning of Virgil's poetics. The eclogue poet proclaims his Muse — not *siluestris* (*E.* 1.2), 'woodland', Tityran (*à la Eclogue* 1), viz. trivial, confined, 'echoic' (*resonare E.* 1.5)[31] — but *agrestis* (*E.* 6.8), 'rustic', Hesiodic. Hesiod is the didactic poet *par excellence*, his 'divine voice' (αὐδὴν θέσπιν,, *Theog.* 31-32), like Linus' 'divine song' (*diuino carmine, E.* 6.67 — *cf. E.* 3.37, *E.* 5.45, *E.* 10.17),[32] a reflection of divinely inspired

---

[29] Callimachus writes: 'Bard (ἀοιδέ), feed the victim (θύος) as fat as possible' (*Aetia* fr. 1.23 f. Pf.). The change from 'bard' and 'victim' to 'shepherd' (*pastorem*) and 'sheep' (*ouis*) accents the Hesiodic model. Virgil is concerned to remind his readers of Hesiod directly, not (as Clausen [28]) simply tangentially via the Hesiodising Callimachus.

[30] The offering of the crook (*pedum*) at *E.* 5.88 to Menalcas (probably = Virgil) makes reference not only to Theocritus *Id.* 7. 128 f., where Simichidas (probably = Theocritus) is given a staff or crook by his companion in song 'as a token of friendship from the Muses' (ἐκ Μοισᾶν ξεινήιον), but also to Hesiod's account of his initiation by the Muses, who (*Theog.* 30-32) present him with a staff of sturdy laurel and breathe into him a 'divine voice' (αὐδὴν θέσπιν).

[31] The contrast between the spiritually sustaining and generative *agrestis Musa* and the trivial, confined, 'echoic' *siluestris Musa* — ignored by critics: see, e.g., Z. Stewart, 'The Song of Silenus', *HSCP* 64 (1959) 197, J. P. Elder, '*Non iniussa cano*: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue', *HSCP* 65 (1961) 116, Segal [26] 413, Putnam [5] 197 f., Berg [3] 145, F. Muecke, 'Virgil and the Genre of Pastoral', *Aumla* 44 (1975) 173 f., D.O. Ross Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge 1975) 19, Coleman [5: *Vergil: Eclogues*] *ad E.* 6.8 — is confirmed by the contrasting Lucretian contexts from which Virgil borrows the phrases (*agrestis Musa, DRN* 5.1398; *siluestris Musa, DRN* 4.589). See Boyle [10] 121 ff.

[32] *Diuinus* ('divine') is used only four times in the *Eclogues* and each time of a poet or artist: Alcimedon (*E.* 3.57), Mopsus (*E.* 5.45), Linus (*E.* 6.67), Gallus (*E.* 10.17). The sense is that of

knowledge and understanding, the cognisance of things past and things to come (*Theog.* 32). He is the poet of power: even the rigid ash is transformed by his song (*E.* 6.71). He represents an ideal of didactic efficacy, of song's power and importance, the actuality of which in Virgil's contemporary world and the possibility of which in Virgil's poetic life are the subject of insistent intellectual scrutiny in the succeeding eclogues.

The initial triad had paved the way.[33] *Eclogue* 1's proclamation of the death of Meliboeus' song (*carmina nulla canam*, 'I shall sing no songs', *E.* 1.77) and the trivial resonance of Tityrus' muse (*E.* 1.1-5)[34] is developed in *Eclogue* 2 into a full-scale illustration of poetry's impotence, its reduction by the city, to which Alexis had fled, to the status of a 'futile exercise' (*studio inani*, *E.* 2.5).[35] Not only does Corydon's song prove ineffective in drawing Alexis back into the country, but the song and the self-analysis it contains fail to affect the dislocation of Corydon's own world, the disruption of the pastoral norms and values which have hitherto defined it. Despite the recognition of Alexis' indifference the song is sung 'repeatedly' (*adsidue*, *E.* 2.4), and, as the final line discloses (*inuenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin*, 'You'll find, if this one spurns you, another Alexis', *E.* 2.73), the elaborate self-meditation of which much of the song consists teaches Corydon nothing. One Alexis (*E.* 2.1) simply leads to another (*E.* 2.73); formally and experientially the cycle is complete. In contrast to the Cyclops of Theocritus' eleventh idyll (*Id.* 11.80-81) Corydon does not alleviate his personal chaos with song.[36]

'divinely inspired' (as with the 'divine' voice breathed into Hesiod by the Muses), 'possessing divine truth and knowledge' — and thus able to serve as a spiritual bridge between man and god. (*Cf.* also Horace *A.P.* 391 ff.: *sacer interpresque deorum*, 'sacred spokesman of the gods', 391 [= Orpheus]; *honor et nomen diuinis uatibus atque/carminibus uenit*, 'honour and fame came to divine bards and songs', 400 f., because of their *sapientia*.) *Diuinus* is an epithet suggestive of Virgil's poetic ideal, and not, as A. Cartault, *Études sur les Bucoliques de Vergile* (Paris 1897) 133, maintains, simply 'un motif de rhétorique'.

[33] The triadic structure of the *Eclogues* book merits more attention than it has received. The idealising triad at the centre of the book (*E.* 4: ideal world, *E.* 5: ideal hero, *E.* 6: ideal song) is framed by two realistic triads: *E.* 1-3, *E.* 7-9. *E.* 10 brings the issues of the triadic sequence to climactic conclusion. The triadic structure is of course not the only structure evident in the *Eclogues* book. Other structural principles are: bipartite, recessed panel, alternating and linear. See Boyle [1] 12-16.

[34] The contention of G. K. Galinsky, 'Vergil's Second *Eclogue*: Its Theme and Relation to the *Eclogue* Book', *C&M* 26 (1965) 175, that *Eclogue* 1 'leaves no doubt about the might of poetry: it can heal, it can overcome reality', is the precise opposite of what is the case.

[35] *Cf.* the description of the pictures on Dido's temple at *Aeneid* 1.464 as a *pictura inanis* ('futile picture'): see n. 38 below.

[36] Galinsky [34] 164 makes the same observation; not so Putnam [5] 114-16, and Otis [5] 120-24. L. P. Wilkinson's view of *E.* 2 and 3 as 'literary *jeux d'esprit*' astonishes (*The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey* [Cambridge 1969] 42). Berg [3] 114 comments sensitively: 'Corydon is no rustic mime, no character type. We cannot laugh at his awkwardness, for there is no distance between him and us. To listen to him is to feel his pain. Who can miss in him the foreshadowing of love's helplessness in Dido?'

The theme of song's futility is expanded in *Eclogue* 3 to include works of art other than song, engraved cups of a 'divine' artist:

M. uerum, id quod multo tute ipse fatebere maius,
insanire libet quoniam tibi, pocula ponam
fagina, caelatum diuini opus Alcimedontis,
lenta quibus torno facili superaddita uitis
diffusos hedera uestit pallente corymbos.
in medio duo signa, Conon et — quis fuit alter,
descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem,
tempora quae messor, quae curuus arator haberet?
necdum illis labra admoui, sed condita seruo.

D. et nobis idem Alcimedon duo pocula fecit
et molli circum est ansas amplexus acantho,
Orpheaque in medio posuit siluasque sequentis.
necdum illis labra admoui, sed condita seruo.
si ad uitulam spectas, nihil est quod pocula laudes.

(*E.* 3.35-48)

M. But (even you'll confess this far superior),
Since it pleases you to be mad, I'll stake some cups
Of beech, enchased work of divine Alcimedon,
On which a pliant vine imposed by skilful lathe
Clothes its wide-spreading clusters with pale ivy.
In the midst two figures: Conon and —who was the other,
Who marked with his rod for humankind the whole celestial sphere,
Which seasons the reaper should claim, which the bent ploughman?
I've not yet put my lips to them, but keep them in store.

D. For me the same Alcimedon made two cups
And encircled the handles with soft acanthus,
And placed Orpheus in the midst and the woods following him.
I've not yet put my lips to them, but keep them in store.
If you look at the heifer, the cups deserve no praise.

Despite their didactic representation of the fecund interrelation of man and nature, their explicit depiction of rural order and concord generated by man's knowledge (*shared* knowledge) of and compliance with his cosmic and natural environment and by the controlling power of song, the beechwood cups carved by 'divine Alcimedon' fail to affect the discord manifest in the herdsmen's world.[37] From the artist's values and perceptions, embodied in his created work, the herdsmen learn nothing.[38] As Virgil has the dissident protagonists

[37] *Cf.* Leach [5] 175: 'the cups symbolize all that is lacking in these rustics whose conversation makes disorder its theme and takes no account of the beauty of the natural world'. For a different approach to the symbolism of the cups see C. P. Segal, 'Vergil's *Caelatum Opus*: An Interpretation of the Third *Eclogue*', *AJP* 88 (1967) 279-308, esp. 283-92.

[38] Similarly in the *Aeneid* works of art and the perceptions they embody have no lasting effect on human behaviour. The pictures on Dido's temple in Book 1, the Daedalus reliefs of Book 6, the embossed shield of Book 8 are all *picturae inanes* ('futile pictures'). For discussion of this crucial

say with repeated and symbolic emphasis, the cups have never been drunk from, but 'kept in store' (*condita*), hidden away, unused (*E.* 3.43 and 47). It is no accident that Palaemon, to whom the articulation of the pastoral vision is given (*E.* 3.55-57), pronounces both singers 'worthy of the heifer' (*E.* 3.109), not of the cups. The contrast with Theocritus' first idyll, at the end of which (149ff.) Thyrsis receives both cup and animal, is pointed and significant.

It is in the final triad, however, the eclogues immediately following Virgil's promulgation of his Hesiodic ideal, that the irrelevance and inefficacy of song become the prevailing theme — the 'play' of *Eclogue* 7 (*ludo*, *E.* 7.17) leading in *Eclogue* 8 (despite the opening statement to the contrary at 1-5 and its reinforcement by the protestation of the power of song at 69-71) to the impotence of Damon's song (*E.* 8.58-61) and the doubtful potency of Alphesiboeus' song (*E.* 8.108),[39] and thence to Moeris' poignant declaration in *Eclogue* 9:

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

(*E.* 9.11-13)

But our songs
Have as much strength, Lycidas, among the spears of Mars
As, they say, have Chaonian doves when the eagle comes.

Virgil's anxiety in *Eclogue* 9 is not opaque. The proclamation of song's contemporary impotence is given arresting immediacy by juxtaposition with an emotive description of the creative power of song, specifically of Menalcas' song, in a recent, idyllic, Theocritean past (*E.* 9.17-25). The poet's transformation from Theocritean singer, celebrator and creator of pastoral harmony, beauty and joy, to Virgilian singer, attempting to change or, at least, to affect the urban world of political and military power, seems — *Eclogue* 9 suggests — to have brought with it a transformation of poetry itself from potent to impotent song. Although the final line of *Eclogue* 9 (67) appears to envisage the possibility of future, presumably effective song, the thematic focus of the penultimate eclogue is on the unrealisability of Virgil's Hesiodic ideal of poetry's didactic efficacy within the context of a society dominated, not by

---

issue in the *Aeneid* see below pp. 112f., 136-42, 154-56, 173-76, and H. Pope, 'Vergil's *Picturae Inanes*: A Study of the Ekphraseis of the *Aeneid*', Ph. D. Diss. Monash (1974).

[39] At *E.* 8.108 Virgil expressly raises a doubt in the reader's mind whether the *carmina* have in fact brought Daphnis back from the city: *credimus? an, qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* ('Do I trust it [the sign]? Or do lovers forge dreams for themselves?'). Contrast Galinsky [34] 179, and Putnam [5] 290: 'Yet, in spite of her misgivings, the *carmina* do work'.

doves or singing swans, emblems of Venus in her pacific aspect (*E.* 9.13, 29),[40] but by spear, eagle and Mars (*E.* 9.12-13).

Despair and Hope

The scepticism about poetry's efficacy exhibited in the final triad is confirmed in the most personal of Virgil's pastorals, *Eclogue* 10.[41] In four of the eclogues (*E.* 3, 4, 6, 8) Virgil had suggested the hope that through the agency of such men as the statesman and poet, Pollio, and the soldier and poet, Gallus, an infusion of pastoral values into the urban world might take place. In *Eclogue* 6 he had set up the ideal of the poet-teacher, the poet who is able to affect and, indeed, to transform the society to which he speaks, able through song to restore the harmony between man, god and nature which is the existential basis of the ordered, joyous and morally enriched life. The ideal was associated directly with the contemporary figure of Gallus, to whom the supreme Hesiodic task was entrusted by Linus, 'the shepherd of divine song' (*diuino carmine pastor, E.* 6.67); and to Gallus, the 'divine poet' (*diuine poeta, E.* 10.17),[42] *Eclogue* 10 returns in order to demonstrate the unrealisability of this ideal.

In Theocritus' first idyll Daphnis, master-singer of the pastoral world, refuses to yield to Aphrodite, viz., to sexual love, and perishes heroically. In Virgil's tenth eclogue, parts of which are modelled transparently on the song of Daphnis in *Idyll* 1 (*cf.* esp. *E.* 10.9-31 with *Id.* 1. 66-103), Gallus, viewed in *Eclogue* 6 as a potential apotheosised Daphnis (*E.* 5), a potential master-singer of the pastoral world, able to affect the environment and to produce spiritual order out of moral chaos, fails in his attempt to eradicate even his own psychological turmoil and, like a deheroicised Daphnis, yields to the might of sexual love:

iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis
ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite siluae.
non illum nostri possunt mutare labores,
nec si frigoribus mediis Hebrumque bibamus

---

[40] Note the idealising description of Caesar as 'Dionaean' (*Dionaei, E.* 9.47), i.e., descended from Venus, in the song at *E.* 9.46 ff. The contrast between the georgic optimism of the song and the rural chaos and devastation of *Eclogues* 1 and 9 (see n. 21 above) underlines the gap between the Venus-ideal and the Mars-reality.

[41] There is a movement towards 'personalisation' discernible in the *Eclogues* book. Note especially the prologue to *E.* 6, the dedication to Pollio in *E.* 8, the references to Mincius and Mantua in *E.* 7 and *E.* 9 (*E.* 6.1-12, *E.* 8.6-13, *E.* 7.13, *E.* 9.27-28). The identification with Menalcas at the end of *E.* 5 (85 ff.) and his invisible presence throughout *E.* 9 also deserve mention in this regard.

[42] See n. 32 above.

Sithoniasque niues hiemis subeamus aquosae,
nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo,
Aethiopum uersemus ouis sub sidere Cancri.
omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori.

(*E.* 10.62-69)

Now once again neither Hamadryads nor song
Itself please me; once again retreat, forests.
Our labours have not power to change that god;
Not if in the deep mid-frost we drank the Hebrus,
Braved Sithonian snows and the winter's sleet;
Not if, when the bark dies and parches on the tall elm,
We drove the Ethiopians' sheep under Cancer's star.
Love conquers all: let us too surrender to Love.

Gallus' contact with the pastoral world and its song provides no cure for his sexual 'frenzy' (*furoris*, *E.* 10.60). Far from displaying or being affected by the values which his poetry in *Eclogue* 6 is hoped to generate and sustain, he rejects the pastoral world, its poetry, its ideals, and surrenders to the manic and potentially despotic force of 'unworthy love' (*indigno amore*, E. 10.10).

Not that Gallus' sexual *furor* is the sole cause of his failure. The hero of *Eclogue* 6 is kept from his Arcadian vision not only by a demented (*insanis*, *E.* 10.22) love of 'hard-hearted' Lycoris (*dura E.* 10.47), but also by its psychological bedfellow, a 'demented love of hard Mars' (*insanus amor duri Martis*, *E.* 10.44). Sexual frenzy and the passion for war, the *Eclogues*' principal, hitherto discrete paradigms of the contemporary world's spiritual malaise, find in the soul of the poet's personal friend (*meo Gallo*, 'my Gallus', *E.* 10.2) conjoined and parallel illustration.[43] The ideals delineated in the central eclogues — through the apotheosised Daphnis and the poetically and spiritually metamorphosed Gallus — of peace, love, concord, fruitfulness and joy, of song's importance and efficacy, of the revitalising and reharmonising impact on nature and man of the 'divine' poet-teacher, are shown to be the ingredients of an unrealisable vision. The apocalypse of apotheosis and poetic-spiritual metamorphosis is exploded by the brute and brutal reality of Gallus, Daphnis deheroicised, the slave of Mars and Amor.

Total despair is not, however, the mood of the closing lines of the *Eclogues* book.[44] In the eight-line conclusion to *Eclogue* 10 (70-77), amid the notions of the subtle but fragile quality of his verse and its onerous and oppressive nature, Virgil draws attention to his love for Gallus:

---

[43] This conjunction is brilliantly encapsulated in Gallus' final words (*omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori*, 'Love conquers all: let us too surrender to Love', *E.* 10.69), where love (sexual passion) and war become indistinguishable. It is a feature of *E.* 10's climactic role in the *Eclogues* book that the work's major paradigms of spiritual dislocation, previously kept separate, are here conjoined and presented as analogous.

[44] *Cf.* Segal [26] 432.

haec sat erit, diuae, uestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco,
Pierides: uos haec facietis maxima Gallo,
Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum uere nouo uiridis se subicit alnus.

(*E.* 10.70-74)

These verses will suffice for your poet to have sung,
Goddess Pierians, while he sits and weaves a basket
Of slim hibiscus: make them important to Gallus,
To Gallus, for whom my love grows greater each hour
Like a green alder shooting up in the young spring.

This love of Virgil for Gallus is quite other than the frenzied, anguished, disorienting sexual passion which Gallus feels for Lycoris. Gallus' passion for Lycoris is the patent successor of Corydon's love for Alexis in *Eclogue* 2, Pasiphaë's love for the bull in *Eclogue* 6, and the 'unworthy' and destructive loves documented in the songs of Damon and Alphesiboeus in *Eclogue* 8 (*cf.* esp. *E.* 10.22, 60 with *E.* 2.69, 6.47; *E.* 10.28 with *E.* 2.68; *E.* 10.10 with *E.* 8.18); it is a final, dramatic, tragic and unambiguous instance of the sort of love which Virgil uses throughout the *Eclogues* as an illustration of contemporary, postlapsarian man's spiritual and emotional chaos. Virgil's love for Gallus is the experiential and ideological antonym of this. Not destructive, it is inherently creative; as the comparison with the shooting, self-generated growth of the green alder-tree in early spring indicates, it partakes of a generative power equal to that of nature at its most fecund moment. And, since in *Eclogue* 6 the alder-tree is linked by Virgil (and he is unique in this) with the compassion and love of Phaëthon's sisters for their brother, the poet's love for Gallus seems to be allied not to passion but to compassion, loving familial compassion for the distress and suffering of kin. Virgil's love for Gallus is the successor of the augmenting, nourishing, generative, spiritual *amor* which, exhibited by Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1, Damoetas in *Eclogue* 2, Pollio in *Eclogue* 3, the child in *Eclogue* 4, Daphnis and the singers in *Eclogue* 5, Silenus in *Eclogue* 6, Corydon in *Eclogue* 7, and Menalcas in *Eclogue* 9, has throughout the *Eclogues* remained at the centre of his pastoral ideal. That he chooses in the concluding lines of his *Eclogues* book to make reference to the actuality of this love in his existential, not simply poetic experience points in the midst of darkening scepticism to the fragment of a hope.

Virgil's Pessimism

surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae.

(*E.* 10.75-77)

Let us rise: shade is oppressive to singers;

Juniper shade's oppressive; crops too are stunted by shadows.
Homeward, little goats, full-fed — Hesperus comes — homeward.

But the shadows which encompass the first eclogue (*E.* 1.4, 83) close the last (*E.* 10.75-76). Virgil's demonstration of the chaos, violence and dislocation — physical, emotional, intellectual, moral and poetic — manifested in contemporary experience has been too insistent and too lucid for the pervasive darkness of the *Eclogues* book to be modified to any substantial degree by the glimmer of light in the concluding lines. The general movement of the *Eclogues* book from the chaotic reality of *E.* 1-3 to the political, social, moral and poetic idealism of *E.* 4-6, back to chaotic reality in *E.* 7-10 (and to a chaotic reality which specifically undermines the idealism at the centre of the work) suggests with force and compelling clarity that Virgil's hopes for a better, a less misshapen world, his hopes that urban man might relearn the Theocritean values he has forsaken and, embodying the pastoral ethic in thought and action, bring a just, fecund and joyous society once more into existence, are hopes the poet expects to remain unfulfilled.

Essential of course to the realisation of Virgil's pastoral ideal is the success of the poet-teacher, the artist who by his unique, 'divine' perceptions engenders a fresh liaison between fallen man and his environment and produces in the minds of individual men and in society at large a moral and spiritual metamorphosis. But, as Virgil clearly perceives, the power of the artist to teach requires man's willingness or even ability to learn, his ability to subjugate and to control the potentially despotic forces in his psychology which drive out rational thought — sexual passion, ambition, greed, the lust for power, wealth or war — forces which are a kind of psychological madness, which deform, derange and destroy. This is why the failure in *Eclogue* 10 of Gallus, the poet-teacher of *Eclogue* 6, is so significant an indicator of the extent of Virgil's pessimism. For Gallus is a teacher who cannot teach himself, a poet who succumbs to the forces of irrational passion, to sexual and martial *amor*, and finds his own poetic art no cure for his madness. Like Aeneas in Virgil's great epic of the 20s, Gallus is a cogent illustration of man's failure to learn from the perceptions of the artist, from the artist's ability to crystallise human experience and to give its essential and most vital constituents determinate and definitive shape. Like Aeneas he indexes the failure both of man and of art.

Ramifications for the *Eclogues* book are not opaque. The futility of Gallus' toil (*labores*, *E.* 10.64) casts a shadow on Virgil's own poetic labour (*laborem*, *E.* 10.1). By the end of *Eclogue* 10 the *agrestis Musa* to which Virgil aspires, the 'rustic', Hesiodic, Ascraean, potent song which he proclaims in *Eclogue* 6 his intention to pursue (*E.* 6.8), the Muse which his particularising allusion to Lucretius (*DRN.* 5. 1398) seems to mark as a sustaining and generative

spiritual force,[45] appears as elusive, as distant from realisation as Gallus' Arcadian dream. As the sixth eclogue's conspicuous echoing of Tityrus' trivial, internally reflexive, echoic Muse had suggested (*cf. E.* 6.8 and *E.* 1.2 — and note the explicit denotation of Tityrus' *siluestris Musa*, 'woodland Muse', as 'echoic': *resonare*, *E.* 1.5), Virgil's song may be little more itself than the internal resonance of his own created world, condemned to insignificance by inability to reach beyond the confines of the poetic construct into the world of action, events, history. The echoic structure of the *Eclogues* book — both formal and thematic — the resonance of language within and between the poems it contains, the final eclogue's culminating reverberation of the themes and language of the preceding nine, confirm the *Eclogues'* intimated status as *cadre sonore.*[46] Pointedly the concluding eclogue's initial Gallic reverberations (*Gallo* ... *Gallo*, *E.* 10.2f.) are reproduced in its final lines in a transparently echoic mode (*Gallo*, *Gallo*, *E.* 10.72f.) only to usher in pronounced echoes of the opening eclogue itself (*cf. E.* 1.4, 83, *E.* 10.75f.; *E.* 1.74, *E.* 10.77). The terminating movement back to the centre of the pastoral world — *ite domum, saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae* ('Homeward, little goats, full-fed — Hesperus comes, homeward', *E.* 10.77) — the *Eclogues*' last, devastating echo, undercuts the preceding imperative for action (*surgamus*, 'Let us rise', *E.* 10.75), evidences the poet's scepticism. Not Virgil, it is Meliboeus who crosses the borders of the pastoral world — *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae* ('Onward, my little goats, once happy flock, onward', *E.* 1.74) — into the world of action, experience, suffering and history; so doing, he abandons song (*E.* 1.77). The eclogue singer inverts Meliboeus' movement echoically (*E.* 10.77), retreating inwards from the boundaries of private vision, leaving them — it seems — unpenetrated. The shadows which define the limits of Tityrus' world (*E.* 1.83) seem to define the limits of his own (*E.* 10.75f.). Enclosed within the walls of the singer's fictive world outside the world of time, change and history, the echoic Muse, as Tityrus' resonant play exhibits, affects,

[45] For a discussion of the significance of the contrasting Lucretian contexts from which the phrases, *agrestis Musa* (*DRN.* 5.1398) and *siluestris Musa* (*DRN.* 4.589), emanate, see Boyle [10] 121 ff.

[46] On the thematic significance of the *Eclogues*' echoic form and mode see Boyle [10]. *Cf.* also P. Damon, 'Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse', *UCPCP* 15 (1961) 285 ff., who sees the triviality of the echoic pastoral world as residing in its fancifulness. I see it as lying rather in its inability to penetrate its own boundaries, its experiential vanity: *studium inane* (*E.* 2.5), *labor effusus* (*G.* 4.492), *pictura inanis* (*A.* 1.464). The attempts of M. Desport, 'L'écho de la nature et la poésie dans les Églogues de Virgile', *REA* 43 (1941) 297, L. Marx, 'Two Kingdoms of Force', *Massachusetts Review* 1 (1959) 91, Muecke [31] 174, to see the echo motif amelioratively as an illustration of 'the theme of sympathy between the singer and his world' (Muecke) or 'du pouvoir que le poète doit exercer sur la nature' (Desport) ignore *inter alia* the relationship (pointedly exhibited in the case of the insensible Tityrus) between the echoic Muse and a confined, confining world, the boundaries of which it is Virgil's desperate hope (but not his expectation) that his poetry will transcend.

transforms, moves nothing.[47] Its role as model for Virgil's *Eclogues*, for their mimetic, evaluative ordering of experience, for their embodiment of the artist's efforming perception and judgment, points to Virgil's developed sense of poetic futility, the existential vanity of his *labor*, the peripheral nature of his art. Echoes of the literary tradition which the *Eclogues* inherit, the reverberations of Hesiod, Callimachus, Apollonius, Theocritus, Aratus, Lucretius, Catullus, which fill the *Eclogues*' world, enrich the spiritual landscape but underscore its suggested impotence. The echoic Muse does not disturb the universe.

Nor does the universe thereby gain. Any society which relegates art to the status of marginal play is a society unable to learn from its artists, a society adrift from the continuum of values which the great artist inherits and endeavours to convey to the contemporary world. It is not without reason that Virgil, the neoteric successor of Hesiod, Callimachus, Theocritus, and Catullus, the self-conscious inheritor of the entire Graeco-Roman poetic tradition, its forms, its values, its perceptions, intertwines the success and failure of man with the success and failure of the artist. It is rather testimony to his moral courage that in the midst of the bloody violence of the late 40s and early 30s he tried to impress a poet's vision upon contemporary Roman man despite his own pessimism about the possibility of the artist's efficacy. When he had written the *Aeneid* some twenty years later, this pessimism about the artist's efficacy had hardened into an adamantine belief in the inherent inability of man to learn from the artist's perceptions and the consequent inevitability of the artist's failure.[48] It is both a mark of Virgil's greatness as a poet and a sign of the ineradicable and tragic stupidity of mankind that this pessimism about art and man has proved all too justified.

---

[47] There are interesting points of contact here between Virgil's notion of the 'echoic Muse' and recent 'formalist' literary theory, whether of the 'American New Criticism' or 'French structuralist' mould. Robbe-Grillet's notion of literature as *une organisation ludique* could stand, in fact, as a description of the sort of song which Tityrus' Muse represents and which Virgil fears his own may be. To Virgil, however, the problem is not simply or mainly one of theory.

[48] See below pp. 173-76.

CHAPTER THREE

DIDACTIC PARADOX: THE *GEORGICS*

In the ebullient climax to the *Laudes Italiae* of *Georgic* 2, one of the poem's most emotive, rhetorically insistent passages, Virgil articulates his conception of the *Georgics* and of himself as the *Georgics*' singer:

salue, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna uirum; tibi res antiquae laudis et artis
ingredior, sanctos ausus recludere fontis,
Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.

(*G.* 2. 173-76)

Hail, great mother of crops, land of Saturn,
Great mother of men; for you I attempt the theme
Of ancient glory and art, I dare to unseal the holy springs
And sing through Roman towns an Ascraean song.

The *Georgics* is Virgil's proclaimed 'Ascraean song', the poet its 'Ascraean' singer. The mantle of Hesiod, the accolade of didacticism, is fervently and pointedly claimed. The formal debt to the *Works and Days*, a conspicuous model for the *Georgics* (especially of course for Book 1), needs no comment. What requires comment is the substantial debt, which the formal debt reflects, the debt to Hesiodic didacticism in the moral, philosophical, spiritual, not simply technically instructive sense.[1] Patently not a verse-treatise on farm husbandry (its status as a practical handbook is undermined by its immense and odd selectivity, its literary sophistication, and its anachronistic focus on the yeoman-farmer — the *colonus*),[2] the poem even in its so-called technically georgic sections is never simply agronomic in intent, but directed to a sphere of

[1] C. Day Lewis, *The Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil* (Oxford 1966), translating *Ascraeum carmen* as 'a rural theme' (p. 74), not only misses the point but dangerously misleads.

[2] Virgil's exclusive concern with the yeoman-farmer is clearly at odds with the agricultural norm of contemporary rural Italy, viz. the prevalence of *latifundia*, immense estates run by slaves. There is in fact no reference to slavery in the whole of the *Georgics*, which as L. P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey* (Cambridge 1969) 53, points out was 'casually assumed by Hesiod and was the *sine qua non* of Varro's treatise'. Even Cato's *De Agri Cultura*, written presumably in the first half of the second century B.C., was expressly addressed to absentee landlords. On the enormous selectivity of the *Georgics* — nothing on pigs, donkeys, poultry, etc., in contrast to the works of Varro and Columella — and the resulting vitiation of its practical utility, see Wilkinson, 52 ff., and B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964) 147 f. Contrast H. H. Scullard's judgment on the *Georgics*: 'A didactic poem ... giving practical advice to farmers on the cultivation of crops' (*From the Gracchi to Nero*, 2nd ed. [London 1963] 245) — quoted also by Wilkinson. Seneca's famous remark gainsays the handbook thesis: *nec agricolas docere uoluit, sed legentes delectare* ('he intended not to instruct farmers but to delight readers', *Ep. Mor.* 86.15).

instruction larger and more significant: the constituents of nature, animality and existence as relevant to and experienced by 'suffering humanity', *miseri mortales* (*cf.* *G.* 3.66).[3] As in Hesiod, so in the *Georgics* didacticism about agriculture proves metaphor for didacticism about man.[4]

Didacticism and the 'Eclogues'[5]

The *Georgics*' debt is not to Hesiod alone. Practical debts are owed to Aratus, Varro of Reate, Nicander, and manifold technical sources; substantial debts to the anthropocentric physical poem of Virgil's great Roman predecessor, Lucretius, to whom, concerned like Virgil with the analysis of man's context and with the moral imperatives it enjoins, pervasive verbal, thematic and formal allusion is made.[6] But Hesiod is the poem's proclaimed and cardinal model, his Ascraean song a paradigm for Virgil's own. He occupies a position at the centre of Virgil's poetics not only expressly noted but not new. It has its origins in earlier, intricate meditation.

In the *Eclogues* Virgil had cast his poetic vocation in the Hesiodic as well as the Callimachean-Theocritean mould (esp. *E.* 5.88: *E.* 6.1-8) and had set up the ideal of the poet-teacher, the poet of moral and spiritual force, the singer whose 'divine song', *diuinum carmen* (*E.* 6.67 — *cf.* *E.* 3.37; *E.* 5.45; *E.* 10.17) — index, like Hesiod's 'divine voice' (αὐδὴν θέσπιν, *Theog.* 31f.), of divine and universal knowledge — had ability to effect not only imaginative and aesthetic enrichment but spiritual sustenance, even rebirth. The *Eclogues*' ideal is one of

---

3 *Cf.* G. B. Miles, *Virgil's Georgics: A New Interpretation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1980) 63, who sees the *Georgics* as offering ' a commentary on different notions of the human condition'; and M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the Georgics* (Princeton N.J. 1979) 15: 'What purports to offer a methodology to cope with the external world is actually one grand trope for life itself'. For Otis [2] too the *Georgics* is no verse-treatise on agriculture: 'It is, when properly interpreted, a continuous whole concerned with the most central and serious themes of Augustan Rome' (p. 145).

4 Wilkinson's contention [2] 11 that 'the chief *raison d'être*' of the poem is description ignores the *Ascraeum carmen* claim, posits an unexplained change in Virgil's poetic direction after the *Eclogues* and (this is the most serious charge) misses the thematically organic quality of the poem, the pervasive, syntactical nature of its moral, intellectual, and existential concerns.

5 A more detailed discussion of Virgil's attitude to poetry and politics in the *Eclogues* is to be found in the preceding chapter.

6 The influence of Lucretius — both formal and substantive — upon the *Georgics*, personally acknowledged by Virgil in the finale to *Georgic* 2 (*G.* 2.475 ff.) and apparent to all, is immense. Anyone who needs reminding of this has only to read W. Y. Sellar's long chapter on the subject, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil* (3rd ed. Oxford 1897) 199-260. See also more recently W. R. Nethercut, 'Vergil's *De Rerum Natura*', *Ramus* 2 (1973) 41-52. Virgil, however, clearly intends the Hesiodic allegiance to be of especial importance; hence his proclamation of the *Georgics* as *Ascraeum carmen*. The explanation is to be found not only in the formal and substantive influence of Hesiod on the poem but in the role of Hesiod in Virgil's poetic ideology. Servius, of course, saw Hesiod as the main formal influence on the *Georgics*, which he compared to Homer's influence on the *Aeneid* and Theocritus' on the *Eclogues* (*Comm. in Verg. Georg. Proem.*). On Virgil's literary predecessors and debts generally, see Wilkinson [2] 56-68 and 223 ff.

function and power, of didactic intent and didactic efficacy, and Hesiod is paradigm of both. Ostensibly illustrated by Virgil himself in *Eclogue* 4, associated in *Eclogue* 6 mythically with Silenus and contemporarily with Virgil and with Gallus, to whom the Ascraean task is explicitly entrusted (*E.* 6.64-73), the ideal dominates the centre of the *Eclogues* book, informs its thematic movement.

But if the *Eclogues* present the ideal of poetry's power, its didactic efficacy, they simultaneously undermine it. In the initial triad and in the poems following the central eclogues' ideal visions Virgil draws critical attention to both the irrelevance and the inefficacy of song — and, tangentially, of art as a whole — in contemporary experience. Even the echoic mode and structure of the *Eclogues* book itself seem to reflect Virgil's scepticism about the possible power of his art. Reasons for this scepticism are evident: the contemporary world's moral and emotional malaise, perceived as dissociation from nature, as neglect of the cardinal values of the pastoral world — peace, friendship, nurture, joy, compassion, innocence, tranquillity, creative, spiritual *amor*, fecund harmony with nature and man — , as serfdom to the potentially despotic forces of sexual passion, ambition, greed, the lust for power, wealth or war — forces which render man blind to the errors of experience or the dictates of vision, which deform, derange and destroy. And Virgil associates contemporary spiritual dislocation — and associates it specifically — with the triumph of urban man, in the face of whose disruptive political and military violence the poet's prophetic cry is as impotent as dove before eagle:

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

(*E.* 9.11-13)

But our songs
Have as much strength, Lycidas, among the spears of Mars
As they say have Chaonian doves when the eagle comes.

The political world of the *Eclogues* — the world of the godless soldier, of the stranger, of Tityrus' divine benefactor — is arbitrary, violent, physically and spiritually devastating; its relationship to song and the singer is that of menacing, destructive and effective opposition. It is true that the central eclogues express the hope that through the agency of such denizens of the political world as the statesman and poet, Pollio, and the soldier and poet, Gallus, the political world itself might be transformed and song — its spiritual power restored — resume its function of celebrating and sustaining a world in harmony with it, but it is a hope which is raised only to be substantially undermined by the initial and penultimate eclogues' severe depiction of the rural turmoil and dissolution (physical and spiritual dissolution) emanating from the political world and by *Eclogue* 10's description of the 'divine poet's'

surrender, the capitulation of Gallus, Daphnis deheroicised, to Mars and Amor — which reveal Virgil's belief in the spiritual polarity of the political and poetic worlds and in the nullificatory impact of the former on the latter to be one of firm, almost total commitment. In the *Eclogues* the political world is presented as all but immutably antithetic to both the values of the poet's vision and the efficacy of his song. The ideal of Hesiodic didactic efficacy seems articulated only to indicate the virtual impossibility of its contemporary realisation.

'In Medio Caesar': The Politico-Historical Frame

Not so apparently in the *Georgics*:

> Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.
>
> (*G.* 2.176)
>
> And I sing through Roman towns an Ascraean song.

The claim of Hesiodic didacticism in the final line of the *Laudes Italiae* seems to signify more than didactic intent. Alluding to the only other Virgilian context where the word *Ascraeus* is used — the Gallus episode of *Eclogue* 6, in which Hesiod, 'the old Ascraean' (*Ascraeo seni, E.* 6.70), features as a paradigm of poetry's efficacy (even the rigid ash is transformed by his song, *E.* 6.71) —, the claim seems one not only of didactic intent but of didactic power.[7] Its occurrence at the conclusion of a eulogising catalogue of Roman military and political figures — the Decii, Marii, Camilli, Scipios, Caesar — seems to betoken a change in Virgil's attitude not only to the possibility of poetry's efficacy but to the political world itself, the destructive power of which in the *Eclogues* had all but ensured poetry's impotence. It appears a volte-face of considerable proportions, rendered the more conspicuous by several notable passages in which the *Eclogues*' pessimism in both the political and poetic sphere seems to have been revoked.

Politics first. The external proems to Books 1 and 3 of the *Georgics* and the external epilogue to Book 4 constitute a transparent politico-historical frame for the poem, appearing to express a hope on Virgil's part for the spiritual

---

[7] Hence A. Parry's thesis, 'The Idea of Art in Virgil's *Georgics*', *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 50-52, that to Virgil in the *Georgics* the function and value of art/song lies in its ability to confer beauty and immortality upon its subject-matter and thus overcome human misery and impotence in the face of the absolute of death, misdirects. Virgil does of course view the nominal immortality arising from song as *one* of its possible functions (see *G.* 3.46-48; *cf. E.* 6.9 ff.), and song's aesthetic creative power, its ability to give poetic, even beautiful form to reality, including human suffering, as another (*cf. E.* 6.62 f.). It is, however, clearly an error to regard these, as Parry does, as constituting Virgil's 'idea of art' in the *Georgics* or even as constituting its central ingredients. Even apart from the Ascraean claim, the personal section of the finale to *Georgic* 2 (475-89) confirms Virgil's primary poetic aspiration as didactic — as does the whole poem's indebtedness to Lucretian didacticism and fervour.

rebirth of contemporary Rome under the leadership of Caesar Octavian. In the proem to Book 1, Virgil, modelling himself on Varro's *Res Rusticae* (*R.R.* 1.1.5-6), invokes the deities of the countryside, asking them to bless his poetic enterprise; but then, half-way through this exordium, he turns to appeal to another god, Caesar:

> tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum
> concilia incertum est, urbisne inuisere, Caesar,
> terrarumque uelis curam et te maximus orbis
> auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem
> accipiat cingens materna tempora myrto;
> an deus immensi uenias maris ac tua nautae
> numina sola colant, tibi seruiat ultima Thule,
> teque sibi generum Tethys emat omnibus undis;
> anne nouum tardis sidus te mensibus addas,
> qua locus Erigonen inter Chelasque sequentis
> panditur (ipse tibi iam bracchia contrahit ardens
> Scorpius et caeli iusta plus parte reliquit);
> quidquid eris (nam te nec sperant Tartara regem,
> nec tibi regnandi ueniat tam dira cupido,
> quamuis Elysios miretur Graecia campos
> nec repetita sequi curet Proserpina matrem),
> da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis,
> ignarosque uiae mecum miseratus agrestis
> ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari.
>
> (*G*: 1.24-42)

> And you too, though we do not know in which divine council soon
> You'll reside — whether you choose the wardenship of cities, Caesar,
> And the earth's charge and the mighty world honour you
> As author of the crops and the seasons' lord,
> Ringing your brow with your mother's myrtle;
> Whether you come as god of the boundless sea and sailors
> Worship your divinity alone, distant Thule serve you
> And Tethys offer all her waves to have you as son-in-law;
> Or whether you add a new star to the lagging months,
> Where a space opens between Erigone and the chasing
> Claws (already blazing Scorpio draws in his arms
> For you and has left more than a fair share of heaven);
> Whatever you'll be — and it's not Tartarus that hopes for you as king,
> And may you not conceive such perverse desire for rule,
> Even if Greece admire the Elysian plains
> And Proserpine reclaimed care not to follow her mother —
> Grant a smooth passage, and assent to this bold design,
> And pitying with me the country people ignorant of the way
> Advance and even now grow accustomed to our prayers.

Part hymnic address, part encomium — an invocation of Octavian as imminent god of the land (25-28), or of the sea (29-31), or of the sky (32-35) — a most extraordinary piece of writing. It was clearly, like most exordia, written when

the poem was virtually complete, and obviously dates from the time after Actium when Caesar was alone supreme. There is no reference, however, to Octavian's military victories, rather an ubiquitous and emphatic concentration upon his divinity, envisaged at first as lying in the future but finally exhorted as present. Some recent criticism sees this as the product of a wave of popular enthusiasm, combined with the Alexandrian tradition of exaggerated panegyric.[8] Such explanations miss the essential point: Caesar, *qua* climatic *rural* deity. For not only is Caesar presented as the climax of a list of deities invoked (even Neptune, 12-14) under a specific rural or georgic aspect (note especially the progression: *dique deaeque omnes, studium quibus arua tueri,/ quique ... ,/quique ... ;/tuque adeo ... Caesar*, 'Both gods and goddesses all, concerned to guard the fields,/ Both you who ... ,/ And you who ... ;/ And you too ... Caesar', 21-25), but Virgil's initial and concluding focus (26-28, 40-42) is upon Caesar as rural god, to which even his possible emergence as god of the sea or of the sky (or of anything else, *quidquid eris*, 'whatever you will be', 36) is to be reduced.[9] Indeed Virgil's opening description of Caesar as both guardian of cities (*urbisne inuisere*, 25) and fecundating agricultural god, 'author of the crops and the seasons' lord' (*auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem*, 27), seems to present in urban Caesar the possible actualisation of Virgil's Daphnis-ideal of *Eclogue* 5, the ideal of the hero-god who brings fruitfulness, harmony, peace and joy to the land; and, like Daphnis in *Eclogue* 5 (*E.* 5.79f.), Caesar is to grow used — the proem urges (41f.) — to the vows and prayers (*uota*) of the countryside's inhabitants. Even the invocation to Octavian as possible sky-god (32ff.) seems to allude to the *Eclogues* and its ideals; for the new Caesarian star (*nouum sidus*, 32) recalls Daphnis' own translation to the stars (*E.* 5.51f., 56ff.), recalls another star too —

> Daphni, quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?
> ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum,
> astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo
> duceret apricis in collibus uua colorem.
>
> (*E.* 9.46-49)

[8] Wilkinson [2] 163f.

[9] Ignored by J. Griffin, *CR* n.s. 31 (1981) 28-31, who — in a review of A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Virgil's Ascraean Song: Ramus Essays on the Georgics* (Berwick, Victoria 1979) — draws attention (p. 30) to Caesar's invocation as possible god of the sea and the sky and concludes that there is no primary focus upon 'Caesar as an agricultural god'. It would be a strange business if this were so. Griffin in fact not only ignores the reduction of the possibilities of sea-god or sky-god to a specifically rural function (and indeed makes no mention of the proem's concluding lines, in which Octavian is urged to receive the prayers of farmers), but he ignores too both the passage's overtly climactic relationship (*tuque adeo*) to the preceding list of agricultural deities and its important thematic and imagistic relationship to *Eclogues* 5 and 9. It should be noted that the parade of possible divine spheres for Caesar enables Virgil to combine the sense of immense possibility with that of uncertainty and allows him to introduce a reference to the fourth estate and a warning against *regnandi tam dira cupido*, 'such perverse desire for rule' (36-39).

Daphnis, why look up at the old constellations rising?
Look, Dionaean Caesar's star has ascended,
A star to gladden cornfields with fruiting crops and make
The grape lead its colour across sun-bathed hills.

— the fecundating Caesarian star of *Eclogue* 9, associated directly with Daphnis.[10] But whereas the *Eclogues* (and *Eclogue* 9 in particular) point to the dichotomy between the Daphnis-ideal and urban, Caesarian reality,[11] the proem to *Georgic* 1 — in apparent thematic and tonal counterpoint — seems to exhibit in Caesar Octavian the possible nullification of that dichotomy, the fusion of political, social and moral idealism with historical actuality. There are indeed qualifications to this presentation — the emphasis on the unknown nature of Caesar's specific divine function (*incertum est*, 'we do not know', 25), reinforced by the parade of subjunctives which follows, the dependence of this function on a choice yet to be made (*uelis*, 26), the warning against *regnandi tam dira cupido* ('such perverse desire for rule', 37), the paraenetic tone of the concluding lines (especially *iam nunc*, 'even now', 42) — qualifications which intimate that all is still not certain; but despite such, the sense of Caesar's possible emergence as the fructifying hero-god of Virgil's pastoral ideal, sharpened by contrast with earlier, rigorous scepticism, seems positive, arresting and avowed. In this opening exhortation the fourth eclogue's idealising union of city and country, political power and pastoral values, urban order and rural fecundity, appears less a paradise lost, more one about to be regained.

Caesar is of course mentioned as Rome's potential saviour in the finale to Book 1, the young prince on whom salvation depends amid the chaos, the long night, that has followed the old Caesar's death (*exstincto ... Caesare*, *G.* 1.466); and it is Caesar who brings the catalogue of Italy's great warriors to a climax in the *Laudes Italiae* of Book 2 (169-72). But it is in the proem to Book 3 that the Caesarian fervour of Book 1's startling address to Octavian receives its next detailed proclamation, as Virgil, using metaphors of temple, triumph, chariot and games, voices his intention to write a glorious panegyric to honour Caesar:

temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim
tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora.
primus ego in patriam mecum, modo uita supersit,
Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas;
primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit:

[10] It is also associated with Venus (*Dionaei*, *E.* 9.47). In the proem to *Georgic* 1 the Caesarian connection with Venus is similarly linked with the theme of rural fecundity (*G.* 1.28).

[11] See preceding chapter, pp. 22-24, esp. 23 n. 21.

illi uictor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro
centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus.
cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens locosque Molorchi
cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.
ipse caput tonsae foliis ornatus oliuae
dona feram.

(*G.* 3.8-22)

I must venture a path by which I too can
Rise from earth and fly victorious across the lips of men.
I'll be first, if life remains, to return to my birthplace
Leading the Muses in triumph from Aonia's peak.
I'll be first to bring you, Mantua, Idumaean palms,
And in green fields I'll set a temple of marble
By the water where mighty Mincius wanders
With lazy turns and fringes the banks with gentle reed.
In the midst I'll have Caesar; he'll possess the shrine;
For him I victorious, conspicuous in Tyrian purple,
Will drive one hundred four-horse chariots by the stream.
All Greece I'll have desert Alpheus and Molorchus' groves
To compete in races and with rawhide gloves.
I will myself, head decked with a trimmed olive's leaves,
Bring offerings.

Marked allusion to the *Eclogues* (with *G.* 3.11 *cf. E.* 6.65,70;with *G.* 3.15 *cf. E.* 7.12f) intimates the congruence of pastoral ideal and Caesarian power; while the developed conceits suggest not panegyric, rather poetic apotheosis. Like Jupiter enshrined at Olympia, Caesar is to be enshrined in landscape sanctioned by Daphnis (*G.* 3.15; *cf.E.* 7.12f.) by Virgil's encomiastic verse.

The encomium will not lack empirical content. The centre of panegyrical attention, as the second half of the proem reveals, will be Caesar's military prowess and success. Campaigns against the Britons (*G.* 3.25 — putative, as it turned out), victories in the East (*G.* 3.26ff.),[12] the triple triumph of 29 B.C. (*G.* 3.26ff.),[13] successes against the Morini and the Bastarnae (*G.* 3.32f.)[14] are alluded to in imagistic, grandiloquent, honorific language. No plain military achievements these, but 'the arms of victorious Romulus', *uictoris arma Quirini*

[12] Note, however, that Antony is not directly mentioned. Octavian's successes in the east are represented in accordance with his own propaganda as victories over 'orientals'. *Cf.* his repulsion of the *imbellem Indum* ('war-worthless Indian', *G.* 2.172) at the end of the *Laudes Italiae*. Antony *is* mentioned in the Actian engravings on the shield of *Aeneid* 8.

[13] It is difficult to read *G.* 3.26-31 without seeing a reference (presumably anticipatory) to Octavian's triple triumph of 29 B.C.: for victories in Illyricum, Germany and Gaul (first day), at Actium (second day), over Egypt (third day). See esp. Dio 51.21.

[14] The victories over the Morini on the English channel and the Bastarnae on the Black Sea were not actually won by Octavian but accredited to him as now sole *imperator* (Dio 51.21, 24-25). The Morini were included in the triple triumph.

(*G.* 3.27), in triumphant operation. Reference is again made to Octavian's divinity, but more tangentially than in the first book or in the preceding temple image[15] — the reference being not so much to Octavian's personal divinity as to his divine ancestry and the divine favour he enjoys (*G.* 3.34-39) — ; but it is on Caesar's military exploits and glory that the panegyric's substantive focus will fall, as the final statement of poetic intent demonstrates:

mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos,
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.
(*G.* 3.46-48)

Yet soon I'll arm myself to tell Caesar's burning battles
And bear his name in glory for as many years
As separate Tithonus' distant birth from Caesar.

The proem's displayed attitude to warfare and to warfare's glory, which reaches its climax in these final lines, sits ill with the poet of the *Eclogues*; it appears a function of Octavian's envisaged status as second founder of Rome. A reflection of Octavian's contemporary image as protector of Rome's civilised world, a second Romulus, inaugurator of a second golden age, bringer of social regeneration and peace,[16] the proem's Quirinal designation of Actium's victor seems to have moral as well as apotheotic implication. War is intrinsically evil, a mark of postlapsarian man (*G.* 2.539f.), but — the proem seems to exhort — *uictoris arma Quirini*, 'the arms of victorious Romulus', are glorious, divine, just, guardians of civilisation, instruments of peace and spiritual rebirth. The proem to Book 1 appeared to celebrate the possibility of Octavian's apotheosis as a god of urban order and rural fecundity, an urban incarnation of the *Eclogues*' Daphnis-ideal; the proem to Book 3 heralds a poem celebrating, and seems itself to celebrate, the military precursors to that hoped for incarnation.

After the proem to Book 3 Octavian is not mentioned until the epilogue to Book 4, in which the motifs of Octavian's military triumphs and divinity are blended with political and moral ideology:

haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum

---

[15] The image of the temple not only figuratively 'enshrines' Octavian but seems to allude to two historical temples particularly associated with him and thus suggestive of his divinity/divine favour: the temple to the deified Julius Caesar, Octavian's own father-god, dedicated by Octavian in 29 B.C., and the temple soon to be dedicated on the Palatine to Apollo, the victory-god of Actium. The material ingredients of Virgil's poetic temple — marble, doors of gold and ivory — make the reference to the temple of Palatine Apollo (itself of marble, with ivory doors and a 'golden' portico) especially compelling.

[16] Indeed some proposed that the title, 'Romulus', be awarded to Octavian: Suet. *Aug.* 7; Dio 53.16; Florus 2.34. For the association between Octavian/Augustus and Romulus/Quirinus see also Horace *Odes* 3.3 and Propertius 4.6.21 ff.

fulminat Euphraten bello uictorque uolentis
per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.

(*G*. 4.559-62)

Thus I sang on the care of fields and cattle
And on trees, while great Caesar thundered in war
By deep Euphrates and, victorious, gave justice
Among willing nations, and began the path to Olympus.

The image of 'thundering' is patently appropriate to one who is himself a god, or at least almost one, and links effectively with the description of Octavian in the proem to the first book as 'the seasons' lord' (*tempestatum potentem*, *G*. 1.27). But what appears most conspicuous here is the articulation of what in the *Aeneid* features as the central tenet of empire's ideology — the central tenet in fact of Augustanism:[17] the notion of empire and empire's victories as a moral and civilising force:

tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

(*A*. 6.851-53)

You, Roman, remember to rule nations with your power —
These will be your arts — to stamp peace with men's practice,
To spare the humbled and to crush the proud in war.

It is noteworthy that, whereas in the *Aeneid* the catalogue of subject eastern races concluding the engravings on the great shield of Book 8 ends with the image of *indignatus Araxes* (*A*. 8.728), in the epilogue to the *Georgics* the conquering Octavian distributes his justice 'among *willing* nations' (*uolentis/ per populos*, *G*. 4.561f.). The *Eclogues'* deeply realised scepticism about the ordering, civilising possibilities of the political world seems rescinded, indeed remote.

But if the *Eclogues*' political pessimism seems reversed in the *Georgics*, so also in places does its poetic pessimism, its scepticism about the possibility of poetry's power, song's efficacy. With Caesarian triumph and success seem to be associated not only political, social and moral possibilities, but poetic possibilities, a union of poetry and political power in fact of the sort Virgil had dreamt of in the *Eclogues* via the figure of Pollio, but which he had labelled in the *Eclogues* as all but impossible:

sed carmina tantum
nostra ualent, Lycida, tela inter Martia quantum

[17] Exemplified in the four cardinal virtues commemorated on the golden shield presented to Augustus by the Senate and People of Rome in 28/27 B.C.: *uirtus, clementia, iustitia, pietas* (*Res Gestae* 34). See also *Res Gestae* 3 (quoted in note 8 to chapter V).

Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas.

(*E.* 9.11-13)

But our songs
Have as much strength, Lycidas, among the spears of Mars
As they say have Chaonian doves when the eagle comes.

This conflict of poetry and political or military power is viewed in the *Eclogues* as a major cause of poetry's impotence. In the great proems of the *Georgics* — as in the *Laudes Italiae* of Book 2 — not only seems there no conflict, there appears a conjunction. Right from the start of the work, in the exordium itself, the union of poetry and political power, of poetic and political concerns and aims, seems openly and forcefully asserted. Witness the poet's concluding address to Caesar:

da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis,
ignarosque uiae mecum miseratus agrestis
ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari.

(*G.* 1.40-42)

Grant a smooth passage, and assent to this bold design,
And pitying with me the country people ignorant of the way
Advance and even now grow accustomed to our prayers.[18]

In the proem to Book 3 there appears to be an even greater union of poetry and politics contemplated — what might be called the fusion of the poetic and the politico-military worlds. The subject matter of Virgil's future poetry will be Caesar's military triumphs and glorious ancestry: victorious (*uictor*, *G.* 3.9,17), triumphant poet will sing of victorious, triumphant Romulus (*uictoris Quirini*, *G.* 3.27); both will earn fame, glory and an eternal name (*G.* 3.8ff., 46ff.). Indeed the poet — and the reference to the Ascraean/Gallus-ideal of *Eclogue* 6 seems unmistakable — will lead the Muses down in triumph from Aonia's peak (*Aonio ... deducam uertice Musas*, *G.* 3.11; *cf. E.* 6.65 and 70),[19] will bear the palm of victory (*G.* 3.12) and enshrine Caesar in his verse (*G.* 3.13 ff.), and with the power of his song carry Caesar's name in fame through the ages (*G.* 3.47f.). This seems a far cry from the world of the *Eclogues* and an even further cry from the world of the *Aeneid.* It seems to express a confidence on Virgil's part in the fruitful possibilities of the union of poetry and the political world, a confidence in poetry's importance and efficacy blatantly at odds, in fact — as

[18] Miles' attempt [3] 70 to construe *mecum* (*G.* 1.41) as syntactically ambiguous (i.e., intended to modify *ignaros uiae* as well as *miseratus*) is, despite Servius *ad loc.*, mistaken. It produces excruciating syntax and ignores the obvious conjoining effect of the alliteration *mecum miseratus*, reinforced by the immediately preceding main caesura. See also Griffin [9] 25 and the obvious parallel at *G.* 2.39: *tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem* ('Draw near and speed with me on the task begun').

[19] The sense of 'leading in triumph' is particularly apparent at *G.* 3.11, consonant with the contextual metaphor of poet as returning general.

the references to *Eclogues* 6 and 7 indicate — blatantly and *consciously* at odds with his earlier scepticism. It is not without significance that the epic which here Virgil imagines writing in glorification of Caesar's 'burning battles' (*ardentis pugnas*, *G.* 3.46), which, as the reference to Ennius in line 9 and to Pindar in the metaphors of chariot and temple suggest,[20] was to be Roman, historical and panegyrical, was never written. The *Aeneid* is precisely *not* that epic.

Theme and Structure: Nature's 'Aeterna Foedera'

Paradox manifests itself. Within the *Georgics'* framework of exhibited political and poetic fervour the dark voice of the *Eclogues* permeates the work. The earlier work's pessimistic, if compassionate, attitude to man and to the social and moral possibilities of human life is unambiguously displayed in the later work's exploration of the brute constituents of human and animal life, of the existential conditions of humanity and animality as such, of nature's 'eternal covenants' (*aeterna foedera*, *G.* 1.60) — an exploration which pervades the poem's technical and didactic substance, dominates the thematic movement of the work, and culminates in a mythic paradigm of what had been the *Eclogues*' major and climactic focus: the inefficacy of poetry and of art. The following analysis of the *Georgics* attends to the conceptual and thematic movement of the poem proper, that is to say, the poem exclusive of its politico-historical frame. It aims to describe that movement from Book 1 through to Book 4 and to demonstrate and clarify both its intricacy and its pessimism.[21]

Book 1 of the *Georgics* is a dark, brooding, existentially pessimistic book.[22] The cultivation of land for the production of cereals is its formal subject, but even in the initial instructions on ploughing and land-improvement (43-117)

---

[20] *Cf.* Ennius' famous self-epitaph: *uolito uiuus per ora uirum* ('alive I fly across the lips of men', quoted in Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34); with *G.* 3.10ff. *cf.* also Lucretius' description of Ennius at *DRN.* 1.117-19. For Pindar's chariot of song: *O.* 6.22ff., 9.81; *P.* 10.65; *N.* 1.7; *I.* 2.1 f., 5.38, 8.61; fr. 124a. Virgil's poetic temple seems indebted to Pindar's visualisation of poetry in terms of architecture and sculpture: *O.* 6.1 ff.; *P.* 6.5 ff., 3.113, 4.81; *N.* 1.8. See L. P. Wilkinson, 'Pindar and the Proem to the Third Georgic', in W. Wimmel (ed.), *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur* (Wiesbaden 1970) 286-90.

[21] It is worth stating at the outset my basic disagreement with Miles' [3] recent attempt to describe the poem's thematic movement. His view that 'successive books of the poem may be seen as elaborating and critically examining quite different versions of rustic life' (p. xii) — with which Miles' own analysis is hardly consistent (the proem to Book 3 according to Miles 177 ff. offers a different vision not of rustic life at all) — seems far too simplistic an approach to the paradoxes and dialectic of the poem and involves Miles in misinterpretations of the relationship of the finales of the first three books to the thematic content of the books themselves and to each other. Miles' account in fact obfuscates the ideal/real contrast around which the poem — in typically Virgilian fashion (*cf.* both the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid*) — revolves, and obscures the thematic role of the politico-historical frame.

[22] With the following analysis of Book 1's pessimistic import *cf.* B. Otis' remarks in his excellent review of Wilkinson [2]: 'A New Study of the *Georgics*', *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 50-52.

it is clear that Virgil has more far-reaching purposes in mind. The resistance of nature, for example, and the consequent arduousness of the agricultural task are apparent at the outset and become dominant themes in the book, as Virgil with compelling specificity draws attention throughout the first half of *Georgic* 1 to the harsh variety of agricultural *labor* — multiple ploughing, manuring, laying ash, rotating crops, breaking clods, burning stubble, cross-ploughing, irrigating or draining the land (43-117), even making one's own tools or rather 'weapons', *arma* (160)[23] — , depicting a war between man and recalcitrant nature in which nature's hostile forces seem immense. Geese, cranes, succoury, trees, serpents, wolves, mildew, thistles, burs, caltrops, darnel, oats, weeds, birds, shade, drought, mice, moles, toads, weevils, ants, reluctant soil, rain, brambles (118-275) — to name but some of nature's cohorts — menace and harass the farmer and his toil. Military regimen and military action are essential. This the imagery of the opening instructions indicates (*exercetque frequens tellurem atque imperat aruis*, 'Ever at his post he trains the land and commands the fields', 99; *cf.* 104-06). This Book 1's developed analogy between husbandry and the arts of war confirms.[24] It is no linguistic accident that the term connecting the farmer to the circumstances of his life (146), to the ploughshare he uses (261), to the human race itself (63) and the stones or earth from which it sprang,[25] is the soldier's defining epithet: *durus* ('hard', 'hardy', 'tough', 160).[26]

The war with nature of course has its rewards: harvests can be 'boundless' (*immensae*, 49), crops 'joyous' (*laetis*, 69; *cf.* 1, 101-02), the earth grateful (83), and the burden of *labor* itself seems to have a teleological basis — ordained apparently by Jupiter, as the Theodicy of Book 1 proclaims, to ensure the gradual development of man's knowledge and skill. The retributive theory of human toil announced in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (*WD.* 42ff.) seems in fact

[23] It seems that Virgil was the first to apply the term, *arma* (literally, 'weapons'), to a farmer's tools. See Wilkinson [2] 80.

[24] Throughout the first half of *Georgic* 1 husbandry is seen in terms of militaristic behaviour: discipline and training (99, 210, 220, 268), being at one's post (99), launching attacks (104f., 155), leading troops (106, 269), leading enemies away in triumph (114), subjugation (125), conquest (145), control (157), defence (270), ambush (271), putting to the torch (271). For instances of military imagery in other books see especially *G.* 2.278-84, 369f., 407; *G.* 3.11, 46, 220ff., 346-48; *G.* 4.4f., 67ff., 107f., 165ff., 217f., 313f.

[25] Virgil goes for the 'stones' version at *G.* 1.62f.: ***Deucalion uacuum lapides iactauit in orbem,/unde homines nati, durum genus*** ('Deucalion threw stones into an empty world,/From which men were born, a hard race'); and for the 'earth' version at *G.* 2.340f.: ***uirumque/terrea progenies duris caput extulit aruis*** ('and man's/Earth-born race reared its head from the hard fields'). There is but small difference. Both passages seem intended to recall Lucretius (*DRN.* 5.925f.): ***at genus humanum multo fuit illud in aruis/durius, ut decuit, tellus quod dura creasset*** ('But the human race in the fields was then much/Hardier, as was fitting, since the hard earth had made it').

[26] *Cf. **Scipiadas duros bello*** ('the Scipios hard in war', *G.* 2.170); ***duri Martis*** ('hard Mars', *E.* 10.44).

specifically rejected, as the stirring promulgation of 121ff. takes what Lucretius had seen as the essential *cause* of man's evolution — the 'gradual' (*paulatim*, *DRN*. 5.1453, 1454) effect of 'practice combined with the experience of an active mind progressing little by little' (*usus et impigrae simul experientia mentis/ ... pedetemptim progredientis*, *DRN*. 5. 1452f.) — and transforms it into the purpose of *labor* itself:

ut uarias usus meditando extunderet artis
paulatim.

(*G*. 1.133f.)

That practice and thought might forge the diverse arts
Gradually.

But despite this providential exegesis,[27] *labor*, like the oppressive indigence with which at 145-46 it is associated, is presented as a great burden upon man and an unremitting, incessant one: it is essentially *improbus*.[28] Necessary to man's survival, the possibilities for its frustation are as unending — as the focus on the many nullificatory agents in nature shows — as the need for it is continuous. The description of the Ambarvalia at 338ff., the providential opening of the Weather-Signs section at 351ff. and the account of the signs of good weather which it contains contrast with but fail to alleviate the book's preoccupation with the unending nature of toil.[29] The arresting picture of the

[27] Which it is perhaps not unreasonable to label 'Stoic': so Miles [3] 93 ff. and many others. The distinction, however, between the possible provenance of an idea and its treatment and function in context is crucial. Virgil had a magpie mind but one that critically utilised and critically placed the ideas and images 'stolen'.

[28] Even Wilkinson [2], who argues that Virgil's overall attitude to *labor* and to man's existential context is providential, agrees that *improbus* 'is an epithet which is always pejorative' (p. 141). His further contention that the word merely 'represents what the individual toiler would say about his work at the time', i.e. that *improbus* has no objective force, not only ignores the climactic force of lines 145 f., and their relationship to the initial premiss of the *colendi haud facilis uia* ('uneasy path of husbandry', 121 f.), but would force upon the reader a similarly relativistic thesis of *duris in rebus* ('in hard circumstances', 146) which would be clearly absurd. The emphasis in *Georgic* 1 upon the difficulties, frustrations and unremitting nature of man's toil — its *objectively* 'unremitting', 'relentless' nature — undermines the Wilkinson interpretation. Significantly perhaps Wilkinson in his earlier study, 'The Intention of Virgil's *Georgics*', *G&R*. 19 (1950) 19-28, took *improbus* in a good sense. On *improbus* see also J. Henry, *Aeneidea* (London and Dublin 1873-79) II 175; H. Altevogt, *Labor Improbus: Eine Vergilstudie* (Münster 1952); Otis [2] 157 n. 1; and Miles [3] 85, whose translation 'ruinous', however, and specific interpretation — 'both *labor* and *egestas* are threats to a civilized existence' — miss the mark. Interesting remarks on Virgil's alleged 'providential' outlook are contained in A. La Penna, 'Esiodo nella cultura e nella poesia di Virgilio', *Fondation Hardt Entretiens* 7 (1960) 238 f. — 'Se si guarda attentamente, la giustificatione provvidenziale in Virgilio o non c'è o è molto debole', 238 — and the ensuing discussion, 258-61.

[29] Note that the festivities of the Ambarvalia take place within a context of fear (*metuens*, 335), and that in the Weather-Signs section the description of the signs of good weather (393-423) is encompassed by two larger passages of darker tone and feeling — the earlier (351-92) concerned with wind and rain, the later (424-63) with the signs given by the moon and sun. The second passage in fact, though ostensibly concerned with good and bad weather alike, focusses the reader's

havoc wreaked by storm at 316ff. is the most famous instance of an emphasis that permeates the later sections of the book as a whole (e.g. 354ff., 390ff., 427ff., 441ff.), and even the winter cheer of the agricultural community is abruptly curtailed by the pointed reminder that winter has its own allotted tasks (305ff.). All seems essentially to accord with the preeminent theme of the first georgic, man's constant and necessary struggle against the perversities of his environment:

quod nisi et adsiduis herbam insectabere rastris
et sonitu terrebis auis et ruris opaci
falce premes umbras uotisque uocaueris imbrem,
heu, magnum alterius frustra spectabis aceruum
concussaque famem in siluis solabere quercu.

(*G.* 1.155-59)

But unless you attack the weeds continuously with your hoe,
And scare the birds with noise, and check the land's dark
Shadows with your knife, and summon rain with prayer,
You will eye another man's great store in vain
And alleviate hunger in the woods with a shaken oak.

'Continuously', *adsiduis*, is the cardinal term. The natural world's innate tendency to collapse into disorder, its immanent thrust towards anarchy, dictates imperatives of constant and unremitting toil. A slackening of effort means immediate deterioration:

sic omnia fatis
in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri,
non aliter quam qui aduerso uix flumine lembum
remigiis subigit, si bracchia forte remisit,
atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alueus amni.

(*G.* 1.199-203)[30]

So all things by law of fate
Speed towards the worst, slip back, are swept away;
Just as an oarsman struggling to drive his skiff
Against the opposing stream needs but chance to drop his arms
And the current whirls him away headlong down the river.

The victory of *labor improbus* announced in the Theodicy — *labor omnia uicit/ improbus*, 'relentless toil conquered all' (*G.* 1.145-46) — is in reality but the

---

attention on the role of the moon and sun as signs of destructive natural forces: torrential rain, wind, showers, bristling hail, storms. Even the two references in the passage to fair weather are predominantly negative: the viewing of good weather in terms of the absence of bad (the absence of wind and rain, 435-37) or as the time when men's fears are in temporary abatement or vain (459 f.) confirms rather than alleviates the darkness of the general picture.

[30] Echoes of Lucretian 'pessimism' are apparent. With *omnia fatis in peius ruere* compare *omnia paulatim tabescere* ('all things gradually decay', *DRN*. 2.1173) at the end of Book 2's concluding description of the earth's decay.

triumph of temporary control. When the effort slackens, disintegration and chaos follow, as the finale to the first georgic illustrates, drawing attention to the tragic relevance of these perceptions to the fractured world of post-Caesarian/Julian Rome. For a few impassioned moments the symbolism of agricultural axiom yields to the immediacy and specificity of political and social comment — the disintegration and chaos which Virgil proclaimed as endemic to the agricultural context presented as fully realised in the body politic of Rome itself:[31]

di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater,
quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia seruas,
hunc saltem euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo
ne prohibete. satis iam pridem sanguine nostro
Laomedonteae luimus periuria Troiae;
iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
inuidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos;
quippe ubi fas uersum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem,
tam multae scelerum facies, non ullus aratro
dignus honos, squalent abductis arua colonis,
et curuae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem;
hinc mouet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum;
uicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes
arma ferunt; saeuit toto Mars impius orbe,
ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae,
addunt in spatia, et frustra retinacula tendens
fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.

(*G.* 1.498-514)

Gods of our fathers, native gods, Romulus, Vesta
Our mother, who guards Tuscan Tiber and Rome's Palatine,
Do not forbid at least this young prince to succour
An age uptorn. Long enough now have we with our blood
Paid for the perjuries of Laomedontine Troy.
Long now has the court of heaven grudged you to us, Caesar,
Complaining that you care for the triumphs of men.
For right and wrong are here inverted: many the wars
Across the world, many the faces of sin; the plough lacks
Its honour due, tillers are taken, fields deserted,
And curved sickles are beaten into unbending swords.

---

[31] The relationship between the finale to *Georgic* 1 and the earlier themes of the book (the recalcitrance of man's environment, the necessity of his toil, the natural world's innate tendency to collapse into disorder, the ensuing imperatives of unremitting struggle) is cardinal to its function and meaning, as is its relationship to the earlier military imagery. The episodic approach to this and other finales (see, e.g., Sellar [6] 252-55) can since Burck's insistence on grasping the poem as 'ein organisches Ganzes' (E. Burck, 'Die Komposition von Vergils Georgika', *Hermes* 64 [1929] 279-321) be regarded as discredited. Of course it still occurs. Even J. Mountford, 'The Architecture of the *Georgics*', *PVS* 6 (1966-67) 30ff., who argues for the interrelationship of the introductions and epilogues of the different books of the *Georgics*, ignores the relationship between the introductions/finales themselves and the didactic substance of their respective books.

Here the Euphrates stirs up war, there Germany;
Neighbouring cities, their mutual treaties broken,
Take to arms; unholy Mars runs amok through all the world,
As when a chariot streams from the barriers, gathers speed
Lap by lap, while the driver, vainly tugging the reins,
Is swept forward by the horses, heedless of his curb.

This explosive tirade against war civil and foreign (especially of course the former, but line 509 cannot refer to civil war)[32] brings the military imagery of the first georgic to a dramatic, vigorous climax, as man's instinct for conflict, aggression and war, properly displayed throughout field and farm in constructive warfare with nature, is depicted unfettered, out of control, raging unholily across the world. This failure of control and concomitant perversion of human energy are linked directly with the social and moral distemper of Rome, in which the values essential to moral and civilised order have been inverted, chaos and internecine strife reign supreme, the agricultural world and its glory disavowed. The enunciated tendency of all things to collapse into disorder receives dreadful and contemporary confirmation.[33]

And this disaster too had its signs (463ff.) — signs more horrific than those heralding storm and rain, and unnatural, as befitting the upheaval and distortion of nature which war, and particularly civil war, represents. Images of darkness (esp. 464, 467, 468, 486), concealment (esp. 465, 467), disease (465), sinister menace (470, 484ff., 488), heat and fire (471-73, 488), vast devastation (471ff., 481ff.), violence (471, 481), noise and clamour (475, 486), blood (485) — used with all the controlled and insistent force of organised rhetoric — conjoin with a graphic narration of preternatural happenings (476ff.) to convey the notion of a total breakdown and deforming of the natural order. But these signs are not providential. The gods, if not the instigators of the self-annihilating chaos which Virgil describes (although this is left ambiguous), are certainly indifferent to its spectacle:

nec fuit indignum superis bis sanguine nostro
Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos.

(*G.* 1.491f.)

---

[32] It probably refers to the troubles on the Parthian and Rhine frontiers which occupied most of the 30s.

[33] Miles [3] 108 remarks: 'The civil war reveals the full meaning of the assertion that man's *labor omnia uicit/improbus* ("toil has overcome all things/ruinous toil"). With the assassination of Caesar and the civil wars man's toil has finally transformed the very cosmos'. Precisely the opposite seems intended by Virgil in this finale: *labor* is conspicuous for its absence (hence the prayer for Caesarian *labor*, 500ff.); nothing has been mastered or 'overcome'; the focus is on disorder and absence of control; and the concluding simile of the runaway chariot patently recalls that of the skiff at *G.* 1.201ff., which underlines the need for continuous *labor*, picturing the disastrous consequences of its abatement. No image of the triumph of *labor improbus*, the helplessness of the *auriga* rather suggests that even Caesarian *labor* may not be enough.

Nor did the high ones think it unseemly that twice with our blood
We enrich Emathia and the broad plains of Haemus.

di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater,
quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia seruas,
hunc saltem euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo
ne prohibete.

(*G.* 1.498-501)

Gods of our fathers, native gods, Romulus, Vesta
Our mother, who guards Tuscan Tiber and Rome's Palatine,
Do not forbid at least this young prince to succour
An age uptorn.

What little sign of providence the reader may have witnessed earlier in the first georgic is now no longer in evidence. Despite the initial reference to *impia saecula* ('godless age', 468) the injustice of Rome's calamity is emphatic:[34]

satis iam pridem sanguine nostro
Laomedonteae luimus periuria Troiae;
iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
inuidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos.

(*G.* 1.501-04)

Long enough now have we with our blood
Paid for the perjuries of Laomedontine Troy.
Long now has the court of heaven grudged you to us, Caesar,
Complaining that you care for the triumphs of men.

The cry of *satis iam pridem* — echoed poignantly and pointedly by Horace in the opening words of his second ode (*iam satis*, *Odes* 1.2.1) — takes up the gods' indifference to the spilling of Roman blood (*sanguine nostro*, 491 and 501) and, as in the earlier reference, finds the presence of justice wanting. All ancestral crimes and offences against heaven, all inherited curses and tribulations have long been paid for. If the present upheaval and self-destructive madness of Roman society is a punishment for such crimes, it is a punishment in which justice has no part. A tragically relevant paradigm of the virtually irresistible collapse into chaos and disintegration to which all things in nature tend, the war-torn world of contemporary Rome illustrates too (and importantly) the injustice or at least the amorality of such dissolution.

But if the first georgic ends on a despairing note climaxing the book's predominant pessimism, the second georgic begins with a jaunty invocation to Bacchus, the god of wine and joy, contrasting strikingly with the dark cry of Book 1's funereal close:

---

[34] The movement from *impia saecula* (468) through *nec fuit indignum* ... (491) to *satis iam pridem* ... (501) is noted by R.O.A.M. Lyne, '*Scilicet et tempus ueniet* ... Virgil, *Georgics* 1.463-514' in T. Woodman and D. West, *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1974) 59, who sees *nec fuit indignum* as gathering to itself 'a tone of bitter incomprehension'.

huc, pater o Lenaee: tuis hic omnia plena
muneribus, tibi pampineo grauidus autumno
floret ager, spumat plenis uindemia labris;
huc, pater o Lenaee, ueni, nudataque musto
tinge nouo mecum dereptis crura coturnis.

(*G*. 2.3-8)

Come, Lenaean Lord; of your largesse all things here
Are full, for you the land's aflower teeming
With vine's autumn and the full-vatted vintage foams.
Come here, Lenaean Lord, tear off your buskins
And plunge bare legs with me into the fresh must.

The sprightly animated rhythm of the address, the conjunction of words denoting 'plenty' with transparent images of bounty and joyous festivity, produce a heady mood suitable not only for the celebration of the vine, which is Book 2's ostensible purpose, but for an idealising depiction of the joys and glory of country-life, the *diuini gloria ruris* (*G*. 1.168), of which viticulture is but an instance.[35] The first georgic's pessimistic analysis of man's existential context seems momentarily forgotten, as Virgil pays imaginative tribute to the richness of nature and prepares the poetic ground for the articulation of his ideal — a spiritual ideal — of man's fecund relationship with her. As in the *Eclogues*, so in the *Georgics* dark reality makes way for bright idealism.

Dominating the first half of *Georgic* 2 is the theme of nature's variety, the richness of *uaria natura*;[36] announced in line 9, it governs the succeeding sections on tree-propagation, grafting, transplanting, budding (9-82), on trees and vines themselves (83-108), on climates and lands (109-76), on soils (177-258); it reaches an initial high point in the catalogue of vines (89ff.), in which the rich associations of the names of the various vines and wines mentioned by the poet, the varied geography of the places to which the names refer, the laudatory epithets and tributes pervading the catalogue itself serve to convey a compelling sense of the varied munificence and munificent variety of the world at large. Significantly, the concluding focus of the catalogue (103-08) is upon the vine's infinite variety and — by implication — the unbounded quality of nature's largesse.

Even more potent in indicating the glory of nature's heterogeneity is the centre-piece of *Georgic* 2, the encomium on Italy at 136-76. For it is as the crown of *uaria natura*, the supreme instance of nature's munificence, that Virgil's native land receives its inclusion — the lands and rivers of the

[35] Otis' remark [2] 165 is noteworthy: special attention is given to the vine 'because viticulture is the "ideal-type", so to speak, of co-operation between man and nature'.

[36] A development perhaps of Lucretius' notion of the *uarius lepor* ('varied charm') of cultivated fields. See his account of agricultural progress in *DRN*. 5.1361-78, esp. 1376ff. *Cf.* Wilkinson [2] 142.

mysterious east being mentioned as exemplary of nature's opulence and beauty (136-39) only to be designated inferior to Italy herself, whose glories (the contrast with the finale to Book 1 is sharp and particular) are proclaimed to be as infinitely various as they are incomparable: fruitful crops, wine, olives, joyous herds, proud warhorses, snowy flocks, mighty bulls, eternal spring, wonderful fecundity of beast and land; no tigers, lions, aconite, serpents, but noble cities, towns, rivers, seas, lakes, harbours, rich veins of silver, copper and gold, and a dynamic breed of men — the greatest of all, Caesar; truly the land of Saturn, the *Saturnia tellus* (173), a golden age country of immense fruitfulness, worthy to be lauded and saluted in sacred song.

There are indeed several reminders of the need for work, effort and cultivation in the first half of *Georgic* 2 (35ff., 51, 61f.),[37] but the emphasis is not, as in the first georgic, on the onerousness of the agricultural task — indeed it is said to be a pleasure (*iuuat*, 37) to plant Ismarus with vines and Taburnus with olives — but on the glorious richness of nature herself and the joyous resplendent products of the conjoining of man's skill and *labor* with nature's exuberant forces. The *Laudes Italiae* celebrate Italy as the finest example of nature's bounty because it not only possesses her gifts in abundance, but manifests to a unique degree the fusion of her heterogeneous munificence with the works and achievements of man:

> adde tot egregias urbes operumque laborem,
> tot congesta manu praeruptis oppida saxis
> fluminaque antiquos subter labentia muros.
> an mare quod supra memorem, quodque adluit infra?
> anne lacus tantos? te, Lari maxime, teque,
> fluctibus et fremitu adsurgens Benace marino?
> an memorem portus Lucrinoque addita claustra
> atque indignatum magnis stridoribus aequor,
> Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso
> Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Auernis?
>
> (*G.* 2.155-64)

> Add so many glorious cities and the work of men's toil,
> So many towns piled up by hand on beetling cliffs
> And rivers that glide beneath ancient walls.
> Or should I mention the sea that washes the land above or that below?
> Or the lakes so great? You, greatest of all, Larius, and you,
> Benacus, rising with the swell and roar of the sea.
> Or mention the harbours and barriers added to the Lucrine
> And the ocean shrieking loudly with indignation
> Where Julian water resounds with the noise of sea flung back
> And Tyrrhenian tide is admitted to the channels of Avernus.

---

[37] There is even an echo here of the military imagery which played such an important role in *Georgic* 1: *cogendae* ('marshalled', 62) — see J. Conington, *P. Vergilii Maronis Opera* (4th ed. rev. by H. Nettleship, London 1881) I *ad loc.*

The focus on man's toil (*operumque laborem*, 'and the work of men's toil' 155; *congesta manu*, 'piled up by hand', 156) deserves notice. *Labor* is seen not as a dire, frustrating existential necessity, but as the source of man's most brilliant achievements, as the creative basis of civilised life, as the means whereby nature's bounteous resources can be harnessed by man into the constituents of a glorious society.

The idealising tone detectable in the first half of *Georgic* 2 continues into the later parts where, despite the more overt presence of the *labor improbus* motif of *Georgic* 1 (see esp. *G.* 2.397-419),[38] the theme of nature's munificence predominates. Witness the extended eulogy of spring at 323ff. with its densely clustering images of sex, procreation, fruitfulness, growth, release and joy, the description of Bacchic celebrations and largesse at 380ff. with its invigorating picture of joyous (*laeti*, 383; *laeta*, 388) dancing, singing, drinking, games, unrestrained laughter and ripening fulfilment, the passage on trees requiring no cultivation at 420ff., emotively focussed on the liberating, toilless pleasure they provide (see esp. 437-39), all reinforcing the notion of nature's lavish generosity — a generosity which renders man's aversion to the agricultural life not merely unjustified but inexplicable:

> et dubitant homines serere atque impendere curam?
>
> (*G.* 2.433)
>
> And do men hesitate to sow and bestow care?

The sense of a catechisation is palpable and pronounced.

In the finale which follows (458-540) the inexplicability of man's aversion to the agricultural life is further underlined, as Virgil interfuses the themes of *labor* and nature's munificence to produce an idyllic and idealising picture — intensified and rendered immediate by the acerbic portrait of urban life with which it is repeatedly juxtaposed — of the value and joys of the rural world: its carefree peace, its innocence, its 'natural' richness, its hardiness, piety, reverence, justice, purity, its harmony between man and nature and man and man. The notion of *labor* as a generative ingredient of this ideal is cardinal:[39]

> agricola incuruo terram dimouit aratro:
> hic anni labor, hinc patriam paruosque nepotes
> sustinet, hinc armenta boum meritosque iuuencos.

---

[38] Note in this connection the increased association in the second half of *Georgic* 2 of military imagery with the farmer's task (279-84. 356, 369f., 407) and the attention given to the viticulturalist's chief antagonists: fire, 303-14; north wind and frost, 315-18; cattle, sheep, goats, 371 ff.; weeds, 411; rain, 419.

[39] Contrary to Wilkinson [2] 143-45, for a criticism of whose views see n. 41 below. Otis [2] 169 observes the thematic importance of the finale ('It sums up ... the morality of Book II') but seems to ignore the significance of the *labor* motif in the finale's rural vision. Similarly E.W. Leach, '*Georgics* 2 and the Poem', *Arethusa* 14 (1981) 36, wrongly remarks on 'the absence even of *labor*' in the passage.

nec requies, quin aut pomis exuberet annus
aut fetu pecorum aut Cerealis mergite culmi,
prouentuque oneret sulcos atque horrea uincat.

(*G.* 2.513-18)

The farmer has parted the earth with curved plough.
This his year's toil; with this he provides for homeland and small
Grandsons, with this for herds of cattle and deserving bulls.
No respite, but the year is teeming with fruit
Or the young of flocks or sheaves of Ceres' corn,
Loading furrows with plenty, overflowing barns.

The curving plough, the farmer's annual *labor* bring the glorious exuberance of nature to fulfilment, generating sustenance for man, child and beast, filling the land with increase and endless fruitfulness. The ensuing images (519-31) of nature's continuous gifts, children's kisses, wifely chastity, cows' udders laden with milk, fat kids wrestling, men feasting, playing, celebrating in happy concert, exemplify an enriching concord between man and the natural world and between man and man which is the product of and the reward for human toil. Envisaged is a world where toil is lavishly rewarded; what is suggested is a *labor-fructus* ideal.

And Virgil's idealism is overt. The sharp contrast with *Georgic* 1 indicated right from the start the book's essentially idealising tone. Here the contrast with the first georgic's finale (note the precise way in which *G.* 2.513 — *agricola incuruo terram dimouit aratro*, 'the farmer has parted the earth with curved plough' — picks up *G.* 1.494 — *agricola incuruo terram molitus aratro*, 'the farmer working the earth with curved plough' — , and how the chariot-metaphor at the end of Book 2 explicitly recalls the simile of Book 1's final lines) and the transparently idealising language employed by Virgil (especially the 'golden age' quality of much of the description — see 459f., 467, 501f., and note the absence of any reference to the onerous side of *labor*) underscore the ideality of this *labor-fructus* vision. The finale's concluding lines augment this:

ante etiam sceptrum Dictaei regis et ante
impia quam caesis gens est epulata iuuencis,
aureus hanc uitam in terris Saturnus agebat;
necdum etiam audierant inflari classica, necdum
impositos duris crepitare incudibus ensis.

(*G.* 2.536-40)

Before the sceptre of the Dictaean king, before
An impious race feasted on slaughtered bullocks,
This was the life golden Saturn led on earth;
Not yet had men heard the bugles bellow, not yet
The sword-blades ring, laid on the hard anvil.

The mention of Saturn and Italy's golden age takes the reader back to the encomium on Italy, the *Saturnia tellus*, earlier in the book (136-76), but does so only to remind him of the present actuality — an actuality alluded to at 459ff.

and 495ff. in a condemnation of urban life filled with the spirit of the *Eclogues* — militating against the concord between the human and natural worlds essential to the poet's vision.[40] Justice, as lines 473f. observe, has withdrawn from man's world; Jupiter, godlessness and war now hold sway. As the gloom of the finale's closing lines is thrust upon the reader and the sharply conceived images of bugles bellowing and sword-blades ringing secured firmly in his mind — images recalling the contemporary military and social chaos described in the finale to *Georgic* 1 — the suggestion is engendered that this joyous, morally rich and enriching amalgam of human toil and the largesse of *uaria natura*, this *labor-fructus* ideal, may belong irrevocably to the prelapsarian age, to Italy's Saturnian past.[41]

The pessimism with which the final lines of Book 2 encompass Virgil's ideal of a harmonious life of fruitful labour, the *labor-fructus* ideal, is shown in the third georgic to be based on matters other than the accident of contemporary moral chaos. There are intrinsic to the condition of man and beast alike elements which independently of contemporary actuality pose problems for, if not render impossible, the fulfilment of the Saturnian dream. By means of a discourse on herd and flock the poet identifies the most important of these elements and, highlighting the immense havoc each can cause, brings to the attention of the reader aspects of human experience both indisputable and non-utopian. The central constituents of this metaphysic of human and animal life, the twin pillars of brute existence with which the *labor-fructus* ideal has to contend, strike at the core of animality itself. They are the properties in virtue of which man is both an eternal and a finite being: sex and death.

---

[40] Hence Otis' comment [22] 57, that in Book 2 'nature and *civilization* (Rome) are ... seen in positive, beneficent light' (my italics), needs modification.

[41] It is important to observe that the Saturnian golden age referred to in the finale to *Georgic* 2 is not, as Wilkinson claims [2] 144f., one of 'soft primitivism'. This would not be in keeping with the *labor* motif of 513ff., with the attribution of hardiness to the rustics (*corpora praedura*, 531; *cf.* 472), or with the role of Saturn in *Georgic* 2 as the Italian god of agriculture, credited at *G.* 2.406 with the introduction of the *falx* or pruning-knife (on Saturn as agricultural god see Macrobius *Sat.* 1.7.19-26, and Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.38). The softly primitivistic *ante Iovem* age of *G.* 1.125-28 is not associated with Saturn. Virgil's vision at the end of Book 2 seems in fact to owe much to Aratus, who saw ploughing as a constitutive feature of the golden age (*Phaen.* 112), and who seems clearly to have influenced Virgil elsewhere in this finale: cattle-slaying/-eating and the Fall (*G.* 2.537-40; *Phaen.* 131f.); the disappearance of Justice after the golden age (*G.* 2.473f.; *Phaen.* 112ff., esp. 133f.). Other influences on the second georgic's finale include of course Lucretius, whose descriptive contrast (*DRN.* 2.23ff.) between urban artifice, excess and fear and rural simplicity, 'naturalness', sufficiency and joy affected Virgil's presentation here imagistically, verbally and thematically. It is to be observed that Lucretius' later depiction of rural joy (*DRN.* 5.1390ff.), which repeats lines from the famous passage in Book 2 (*DRN.* 2.29-33 = with a few alterations 5.1392-96), follows immediately upon a description of nature-led and nature-concordant *labor* (*DRN.* 5.1361-78), productive of ploughland, crops and 'joyous vineyards' (*uineta laeta*, 5.1372), and a world resplendent 'with varied beauty' (*uario ... lepore*, 5.1376). The influence on the second georgic's *labor*-based rural vision seems manifest.

The first half of Book 3 — omitting the Caesarian proem, of course — is primarily concerned with sex: selection of cattle and horses for breeding (49-122), treatment before and after mating (123-56), rearing of their young (157-208), the deleterious effect of sexual passion upon them (209-41), then the deleterious effect of sexual passion throughout all sentient life (242-83). The fundamentality of sex is first established;[42] the violent and ruinous frenzy it produces is then revealed. And that there be no doubt — even throughout the early part of the book — about the relevance of his observations on cattle and horses to specifically human life, Virgil saturates his account with overtly anthropomorphic language,[43] evoking within the context of animal breeding and sex a great complex of human situations, passions, aspirations. Thus cattle undergo 'lawful marriage' (*iustos hymenaeos*, 60), are described as 'wretched mortals' (*miseris mortalibus*) subject to disease, old age and death (66-68); calves, like schoolboys, need training and encouragement, 'while they have the docile spirit of young men, while their age is pliable' (*dum faciles animi iuuenum, dum mobilis aetas*, 165);[44] stallions experience 'inglorious old age' (*turpi senectae*, 96), show 'grief' in defeat, seek the 'palm's glory' (*gloria palmae*, 102), function as 'leader and husband' (*ducem ... et maritum*, 125) to the herd — their young 'children' (*nati*, 128), themselves 'fathers' (*patrum*, 128). Even the chariot-race of 103-12,[45] though not strictly anthropomorphic, deliberately fuses animal and human activity, the final line's trenchant comment — *tantus amor laudum, tantae est uictoria curae*, 'Great their love of glory, great their desire for victory', 112 — equally applicable to driver and team. Everything leads notionally and linguistically to the densely anthropomorphic bull-fight of 215ff., in which the human analogue is rendered its most transparent by a pervasive employment of amatory, political and military diction (see esp. 215-19, 224-28, 235f.).

At line 242 the anthropomorphic metaphor disappears. The experiential bonds between man and animal which it suggested are now directly stated in a proclamation of the universality of sexual passion and its consuming madness and destruction which has all the poetic and rhetorical force of an apocalypse:

---

[42] Note in this connection the *central* location in the technical section, 49-208, of a substantial passage (123-37) concerned exclusively with the preparation of horses for intercourse.

[43] *Cf.* W. Liebeschuetz, 'Beast and Man in the Third Book of Virgil's *Georgics*', *G&R* n.s. 12 (1965) 65. Wilkinson's psychological/biographical thesis [2] 128 about Virgil's anthropomorphic language surprises: 'The use of anthropomorphic language is so pervasive — I have counted more than fifty instances in the first two Books — that it seems rather to be evidence of the disposition which attracted Virgil to pantheism'. On the implausibility of Virgil's 'pantheism' see n. 66 below.

[44] *Cf.* Conington [37] and T.E. Page, *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica* (London 1898) *ad loc.*

[45] *Cf.* Otis [2] 173: 'The fact is that human and animal emotions here almost merge; the horses, as it were, share and exhibit the spirit of their drivers and thus qualify in spirit and keenness for selection as proper sires. Again the line between man and animal is very thin'.

omne adeo genus in terris hominumque ferarumque
et genus aequoreum, pecudes pictaeque uolucres,
in furias ignemque ruunt: amor omnibus idem.

(*G*. 3.242-44)

Every tribe on earth both of men and of beasts
And the tribe of the sea, the cattle and dappled birds,
Rush to this frenzied fire: love for all is the same.

The terrifying catalogue of animal and human madness which follows — and note the location of the human *exemplum*, Leander, at the centre of the catalogue (258-63)[46] — shows not only the innately destructive nature and the power but also (and more importantly) the nucleic existential status of what in the *Eclogues* had featured as a major paradigm of spiritual dislocation: sexual passion. Elevation — in the concluding focus (271-83) on the wind impregnation of mares and the resulting distillation of the slimy fluid, *hippomanes*, gathered by stepmothers for harmful spells — to the level of the thaumaturgic (*mirabile dictu*, 'miraculous to relate', 275), the monstrous, the unaccountable, serves but to magnify passion's experiential irresistibility. Described here as *durus amor* (259), a confrontation with the *durus labor* of *Georgic* 2 (412), the instrument of growth and fruitfulness in Virgil's idealising vision, seems patently intended.

The second half of *Georgic* 3 moves towards the finale on death. It focusses in the technical section on sheep and goats (295-477) upon the vulnerability of animal life[47] — their need of man's protection, the dangers that threaten them, etc. (see esp. 295-99, 318-21, 404-77 — the pathetic portrayal of the Scythian animal slaughter at 367ff. intensifies this vulnerability motif)[48] — and suggests tangentially by means of a range of associations (see particularly in this connection the idyllic summer pasture scene of 322ff. and the end of the passage on snakes at 435ff.) the vulnerability of the *labor-fructus* ideal itself.[49] The finale on the Noric cattle-plague, in which the concern with vulnerability terminates, then brings to the fore one of the other existential matters with which the vision of Book 2 must contend: the reality, horror and irresistibility of arbitrary suffering and death. The indiscriminate nature of the plague is emphasised at the outset, as is its hideousness and the totality of its extirpation. The language clearly and significantly recalls the earlier apocalypse on love:

---

[46] Leander is of course unnamed, as are all the figures in the vignette at *G*. 3.258 ff. The generalising effect of this anonymity strengthens the vignette's paradigmatic function. See also Miles [3] 198; Otis [2] 175.

[47] Otis [2] 181 construes the smallness of the size of the animals under discussion as *itself* symbolic of 'the powerlessness of life' — a bold thesis somewhat difficult to maintain in the face of the absence of concentration on small animals in the description of 'the powerlessness of life' par excellence: the Noric cattle-plague.

[48] Interestingly the passage focusses on one of the *Aeneid*'s cardinal images of vulnerability and beauty: the deer. See Chapter IV, pp. 125 f.

[49] With *G*. 3.322 ff. *cf*. *G*. 2.469-71; with *G*. 3.435 f. *cf*. *G*. 2.470, 527.

hic quondam morbo caeli miseranda coorta est
tempestas totoque autumni incanduit aestu
et genus omne neci pecudum dedit, omne ferarum,
corrupitque lacus, infecit pabula tabo.

(*G.* 3.478-81)

Here once from a cancered sky a piteous season came
And glowed with the totality of autumn's heat.
Every tribe of cattle it gave to death, every tribe of beasts;
It poisoned the lakes, it infected the food with venom.

The ensuing meticulous delineation of the symptoms, the *signa* (503), of the plague in both its initial and advanced stages intensifies the sense of animal and human helplessness and the horror of unjustified suffering, presenting 'hard death's merciless hand', *durae inclementia mortis* (*G.* 3.68), in relentless, violent, catastrophic, and utterly indiscriminate operation (*cateruatim*, 556). Divine indifference, accented here (486-93; *cf.* 455f.) as in the finale to *Georgic* 1 (491f.), underscores the amorality and unimpedibility of the plague's fetid dissolution.[50]

The relevance of this arbitrary desolation to human experience at large and to the *labor-fructus* ideal in particular is not obscure. The Thucydidean and Lucretian reminiscences are enough to indicate the former, as is the final focus on man's own susceptibility to the plague's contagion (563-66).[51] While the latter, the specific relevance to the *labor-fructus* ideal of the end of *Georgic* 2, seems unambiguously conveyed by the deliberate and developed thematic and verbal contrast between the finales of the respective books, as Book 2's plenitude, joy, harmony and life yield in Book 3 to desolation, suffering, separation and death, forcing the reader to assess the relationship of the *Weltanschauungen* thus juxtaposed, or rather serving to elicit from him the perception of the extent to which the vision of Book 2 is necessarily compromised by the brute amorality of the third georgic's startling close. Indeed lines 474-77, in drawing attention to the *deserta regna pastorum* ('the desolate realms of shepherds', 476f.) and the *longe saltus lateque uacantis* ('the glades deserted far and wide', 477) caused by the cattle-plague, seem designed to set up immediately a contrast with the main elements of the *labor-fructus* ideal, notably its emphasis on nature's plenitude (see esp. *G.* 2.468ff., 516ff.), ensuring the dramatic visibility of the movement from Book 2's increase and bounty to Book 3's emptiness and devastation.[52]

---

[50] The emphasis on 'the unconcern or impotence of the gods' in this finale — a 'Lucretian influence' — is well discussed by Liebeschuetz [43] 76f. Note also that in the finales to *Georgics* 3 and 1 (*G.* 3.503; *G.* 1.463, 471) *signa* are distinctly non-providential (see above pp. 52f.).

[51] *Cf.* Parry [7] 42: 'The transition at the end [of *Georgic* 3] from animals to men makes explicit the symbolic purpose of the whole book. All existence, including human, is doomed, despite our best labours, to annihilation'.

[52] Not that this movement is seen by all. See, e.g., Miles [3] 217-25, who in a discussion of the

Other antitheses highlight this movement. The autumn which in Book 2 had generated rich and varied produce (*uarios fetus*, *G.* 2.521) now glows menacingly with the totality of its heat (*toto autumni incanduit aestu*, *G.* 3.479), the cool, refreshing valleys of the second georgic's finale (*frigida Tempe*, *G.* 2.469; *gelidis conuallibus*, *G.* 2.488) no longer evident. Lakes once full of life (*uiui lacus*, *G.* 2.469) are poisoned and infected (*corrupit lacus*, *G.* 3.481); animals that roamed field and glade (*lustra ferarum*, *G.* 2.471) are given over to death (*G.* 3.480); the joyous grass (*in gramine laeto*, *G.* 2.525) which formed the harmonious setting for the playful wrestling of kids is now the incongruous background (*laetis in herbis*, *G.* 3.494) of premature death; the wine of Lenaeus, symbol in the earlier vision of rejoicing concord between man, nature and the country's gods (*G.* 2.527-31), now brings madness and self-rending annihilation (*G.* 3.511-14). The agricultural life of Book 2 had been likened to that of the golden age of Saturn (*G.* 2.536-38); the plague-infested scene of Book 3, manifestly devoid of the constituents of the *labor-fructus* ideal, yet exhibits a grotesque and ironic similitude to the *aureum saeculum* itself:

non lupus insidias explorat ouilia circum,
nec gregibus nocturnus obambulat: acrior illum
cura domat; timidi dammae ceruique fugaces
nunc interque canes et circum tecta uagantur. ,

(*G.* 3.537-40)

No wolf seeks out an ambush by the sheepfolds
Or prowls about the flocks at night: sharper pangs
Tame him. Timid does and elusive stags
Now wander among dogs and by the houses.

Powerful resonances here of Menalcas' jubilant scene in *Eclogue* 5 (60f.) make this parody of the golden age unmistakable. The gap between moral idealism and empirical reality is thrust imaginatively to the fore, challenging the assumptions of the second georgic's Saturnian vision.

Nor is the challenge indirect. In Virgil's narrative of the death of a bull at 515ff. — an episode to which the reader's attention is expressly drawn (*ecce autem*, 'Look there', 515)[53] — Book 3's assault upon the conceptual and moral basis of the *labor-fructus* ideal becomes explicit and unequivocal.

ecce autem duro fumans sub uomere taurus
concidit et mixtum spumis uomit ore cruorem
extremosque ciet gemitus. it tristis arator
maerentem abiungens fraterna morte iuuencum,
atque opere in medio defixa reliquit aratra.

---

relationship of the final section of *Georgic* 3 to the earlier books totally ignores the thematic and verbal contrast between the finales of *Georgics* 2 and 3.

[53] Conington [37] *ad loc.*: '"Ecce autem" calls attention to a new object like καὶ μήν in Greek'.

non umbrae altorum nemorum, non mollia possunt
prata mouere animum, non qui per saxa uolutus
purior electro campum petit amnis; at ima
soluuntur latera, atque oculos stupor urget inertis
ad terramque fluit deuexo pondere ceruix.

(*G.* 3.515-24)

Look there, a bull steaming beneath the hard plough
Collapses, vomits blood and foam from his mouth,
Heaves his final groans. Sadly the ploughman goes,
Unyoking the bullock stricken at his brother's death,
And abandons the plough, stuck fast in mid-task.
No tall forest's shade, no gentle meadows can
Touch his spirit, no stream clearer than amber
Scampering across the rocks towards the plain. Throughout
His flanks grow loose, listless eyes are glazed with stupor,
And his neck sinks to the earth with drooping weight.

The image of the bull and its plough began the *labor* theme of Book 1 (45f.); the plough was symbol of the farmer's rewarded toil in the Saturnian vision of Book 2 (513ff.); the bull — like the stallion, whose gruesome death is documented immediately before that of the bull (498-514) — was object of the farmer's *labor* in the first half of Book 3. The thematic associations of bull and plough — on which images the narrative at 515ff. lays immediate stress — are thus transparent, and enable the episode's opening focus (515-19) on the bull's suffering and on the farmer's distressed abandonment of bull and plough in the midst of work half-done (*opere in medio*, 519) to draw direct, comfortless and thematically signal attention to the reality of nullified, unrewarded *labor*. In the ensuing description of the bull's death (520-24) this attention is underscored. There is also the now pressing question of existential justice:

quid labor aut benefacta iuuant? quid uomere terras
inuertisse grauis? atqui non Massica Bacchi
munera, non illis epulae nocuere repostae:
frondibus et uictu pascuntur simplicis herbae,
pocula sunt fontes liquidi atque exercita cursu
flumina, nec somnos abrumpit cura salubris.

(*G.* 3.525-30)

What profit his toil or services? What that he turned
With plough the heavy land? Yet no Massic gifts
Of Bacchus, no banquets unending poisoned such as him.
They feed on leaves and the fare of simple grass;
Their cups are crystal springs and the hurrying
Streams, and no cares fragment their nourishing sleep.

Labor may be a necessary condition for the enjoyment of nature's blessings; it is not a sufficient one. The constituents of the ideal environment — the shade of forests, the softness of meadows, the pleasure of freshwater streams (520-22) — can be annulled at a stroke. Toil, innocence and simplicity, even a life in

harmony with nature's pure munificence avoiding the abuses of her goodness afford — as the dying bull paradigm shows (526-30) — no protection against the irreducible and existentially obdurate fact of arbitrary suffering and death.

The concern of the third georgic with the indiscriminate havoc wreaked by sex, disease and death focusses on a view of experience other than that assumed in the *labor-fructus* ideal. It may be possible to build the spiritual landscape which that ideal suggests, but the structure of reality is such that work and reward, moral goodness and prosperity, *labor* and *fructus* are by no means inevitably conjoined.[54] There are endemic to animal and human experience alike brutal, inimical forces whose power to disrupt and to dislocate is as immense as the exercise of it is, if not unjust, at least arbitrary and amoral. The political chaos and spiritual disintegration expounded at length in the finale to Book 1 and alluded to briefly in the closing lines of Book 2 are revealed in the third georgic to be no mere accidents of contemporary life; like the maddening frenzy created by *amor*, like the putrefying death dealt out in Noricum, they are in Virgil's view characteristic features of a world in which the presence of justice is conspicuously wanting.[55] The reality of unmerited suffering, on which the dark finales of the first and third georgic dwell,[56] seems to the poet too central to man's existence to be brushed aside by an idealistic vision; it points to an essential wretchedness, an irreducible element of brute amorality in the human condition, with which any profession of Saturnian values, any attempt to realise a better, juster and more joyous world, has to contend.

The fourth georgic sustains this pessimism.[57] The thematic climax of the poem, it rearticulates and develops the pervasive themes of the poem's first three books — the dignity, value and rewards of the life of Saturnian *labor*, the essential ideality of that life, the bounteous munificence of nature, the fragility of nature's gifts, the creative potential of man, its vulnerability to the arbitrary, nullifying forces of passion and death, the harshness of human progress, the amorality or indeed injustice at the heart of human history and experience —, presenting a final confrontation between the *labor-fructus* ideal conceived

[54] See further the focus on the failure of *labor* in the Aristaeus epyllion — both in the frame story and in the Orpheus narrative (discussed below pp. 68-75). Lyne's judgment [34] 48 startles: 'in the *Georgics* work *is* productive ... this is the point' (author's italics).

[55] This last observation is crucial. G. B. Miles, '*Georgics* 3.209-294: *Amor* and Civilization', *CSCA* 8 (1975) 192, sees Virgil as concerned to prepare his readers to 'accept' the 'great social and political disasters of the late Republic' and the devastation wrought by *amor* as 'a part, however undesirable, of the larger natural rhythm of things'. 'Rhythm' implies harmony and balance, a measured interplay between positive and negative elements of experience. The *Georgics* asserts no such thing.

[56] The parallelism between the gloom of the finales to the first and third georgics has often been noted. What has generally been overlooked or simply misunderstood (see, e.g., Miles [3] 182, 224) is that both books end on the theme of *undeserved* suffering.

[57] Though the book is strangely thought by Otis [22] 45 to be 'cheerful and optimistic' — 'strangely' because Otis' own remarks on Book 4 hardly confirm this judgment.

privately and socially and the elemental ingredients of the human personality and man's world which act as a bulwark against the ideal's fulfilment and undermine its conceptual basis.

The first half of the book, occupied ostensibly with the subject of bee-keeping, seems primarily concerned to restate and develop the *labor-fructus* ideal of *Georgic* 2. The so-called 'digression' on gardening (116-48), for example, with its focus upon nature's jubilant opulence and the connection of this in the *Corycius senex* parable with man's *labor* and skill (125-40), pointedly recalls the second georgic's idealising description of the fruits of agricultural *labor* (*cf.* esp. *G.* 2.516ff. with *G.* 4.139-43, both packed with images of abundance and fecundity)[58] and seems essentially to be introduced — the *apologia* is clearly only a formal device[59] — to form a restatement of the *labor-fructus* ideal at the level of individual happiness and fulfilment. Focussing on a former pirate's metamorphosis into a paradigm of peace and fecundating, nourishing *labor*, the restatement has unconcealed contemporary import.[60]

But if the old Corycian represents individual instantiation of the *labor-fructus* ideal, the carefully structured portrayal of the bee society at 149ff. — a quasi-Platonic utopia, in which work and its rewards are everything, sexual *amor* conspicuously absent, altruism and concord supreme — gives the ideal an overt social dimension.[61] To the apian community *labor* is the supreme social

---

[58] The dense cluster of 'abundance' words at *G.* 4.139-43 impresses: *fetis* ('crammed', 139), *multo* ('large', 139), *abundare* ('abound', 140), *spumantia* ('foaming', 140), *uberrima* ('most luxuriant', 141), *fertilis* ('prolific', 142) — all within the space of four lines. *Cf.* the similar density of *G.* 2.516-18. The old man's natural riches (*regum aequabat opes animis*, 'he matched in his mind the wealth of kings', 132) are clearly intended to mirror those of the *fortunatus agricola* of Book 2 (*diues opum uariarum*, 'rich in diverse wealth', *G.* 2.468), for whom, as for the *Corycius senex*, autumn brings not the disease and death of Book 3 (*G.* 3.479) but nature's varied largesse (*cf.* *G.* 2.521 with *G.* 4.143). The contrast with Virgil's practical Varronian source — the description of the apiary and gardens of the two brothers from Falerii (*Res Rusticae* 3.16.10-12) — is marked.

[59] The *Georgics* never makes even the slightest attempt at agricultural completeness. From that point of view many topics are more inexcusably omitted than gardening.

[60] The old Corycian seems to be intended by Virgil to be understood as one of the Cilician pirates settled in Calabria by Pompey after his successful clearing of the Mediterranean in 67 B.C. So Servius *ad G.* 4.127, Wilkinson [2] 174f. If this is correct, the old Corycian parable not only restates the *labor-fructus* ideal of the finale to *Georgic* 2, but specifically inverts the farmer-to-soldier movement of the finale to *Georgic* 1 (see esp. *G.* 1.505-08).

[61] On the bees as model of a human, social ideal see H. Dahlmann, 'Der Bienenstaat in Vergils Georgica', *Akad. der Wiss. Mainz, Abhand. Geistes und Sozialwiss. Klasse* (1954) No. 10, 547-62. The parallels noted by Dahlmann 555-56 — both verbal and thematic — between the description of the bee community in *Georgic* 4 and the presentation of rural life at the end of *Georgic* 2 connect the apian community specifically with the second georgic's idealising vision. C. G. Perkell, on the other hand, in her interesting essay, 'A Reading of Virgil's Fourth Georgic', *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 211-21, minimises the socio-political import of the bee community, contending that the bees are intended to function primarily as 'guardians and symbols of chastity' (214). Virgil's intention in this section she sees as being to suggest proleptically the 'cause' of Aristaeus' loss of his swarm (viz. sexual unchastity, attempted rape). Such a view, however, is difficult to reconcile with the relationship between Virgil's description of the bee community and the finale to *Georgic* 2 and with

value, the essential source of its harmony; itself it 'glows' like fire (*feruet opus*, 169), aided, not impeded by *amor*. The *amor* which drives the bees is not the dislocating sexual force of Book 3 but an 'innate love of having' (*innatus amor habendi*, 177; *cf.* their *amor florum*, 'love of flowers', 205),[62] a desire to enrich the whole community (for they 'store their gains for the common use', *in medium quaesita reponunt*, 157)[63] — quite other than the private and perverse pursuit of luxury decried in Book 2 (461ff., 505ff.) — a desire which augments, not terminates their toil. The antithesis of *labor* and sexual *amor* already suggested in Book 3 is given salient attention by the poet, who sees the selfless work ethic of the bee community (their goal is not the preservation of their own individual lives but the social task itself and the continuation of the race [203-09] — hence their dedication to the *rex*, on whom the society's functioning, prosperity and concord depend [212-14]) as inextricably bound up with their lack of sexual desire and behaviour and the associated anti-*labor* values of indulgence and idleness (197f.). In using the expression, *labor omnibus unus* (180), Virgil recalls Book 3's proclamation of the universality of sexual passion, *amor omnibus idem* (*G.* 3.244), only to show its replacement in the bee community by a more socially productive force.

Virgil's prolonged emphasis in this section of *Georgic* 4 on the bees' social organisation. To the bees' asexual method of propagation Virgil devotes six lines (*G.* 4.197-202); to their social organisation or aspects thereof he devotes seventy lines (including the six above: *G.* 4.149-218). It is relevant to note that the bee community of *Georgic* 4 is overtly recalled in the first book of the *Aeneid*, where — in a simile which quotes extensively from *Georgic* 4 (*A.* 1.430-36 = with very few changes *G.* 4.162-64, 167-69) — it functions as a model not for chastity but for the co-operative dedication and fervour of the Carthaginian people as they build their city.

[62] It has been argued (e.g. by Perkell [61] 213; *cf.* P. J. Davis, 'Vergil's *Georgics* and the Pastoral Ideal', in Boyle [9] 29) that *amor habendi* is a serious moral or spiritual flaw, and certainly in the only other Virgilian passage where *amor habendi* occurs — Evander's description of the end of the golden age in *Aeneid* 8 (*A.* 8.327) — it obviously functions as a moral vice (roughly = 'greed'). The *Georgics*' position, however, differs markedly. In the *Aeneid* passage *amor habendi* is linked with *belli rabies* ('the frenzy of war', *A.* 8.327) and both are castigated by Evander; in *Georgic* 4 the bees' *amor habendi* is separated from their penchant for warfare (*G.* 4.67ff.), the former to be encouraged by the apiarist, the latter not. *Amor habendi* in fact does not mean 'greed' at all in the *Georgics* passage (*pace* Davis). Intricately bound up with *labor* — it is precisely because one does not have things that one is driven to work for them (see esp. *G.* 1.129ff.) — *amor habendi* is the psychological corollary of *urgens egestas* ('impelling poverty', *G.* 1.146) and connotes quite simply a love of/desire for having things. Not that all *amor habendi* according to the *Georgics* is therefore good. The moral status of the *amor* will depend on what one is driven to have; it can be misdirected, as the false pursuits of the *urbs* attest. The main point about the bees' *amor habendi* is that it is directed not to personal aggrandisement but to the enrichment of the whole community.

[63] The phrase recalls the description of the pre-Jupiter, pre-*labor* age of natural plenty outlined in *Georgic* 1's Theodicy (*cf.* esp. *G.* 1.127: *in medium quaerebant*, 'they acquired things for the common use'). Juxtaposed as it is with a focus on the bees' *labor* (*laborem experiuntur*, 'they engage in work', *G.* 4.156 f.), it reinforces the notion of the bee community as a paradigm of a *labor*-based golden age, i.e. of the *labor-fructus* ideal. *Cf.* E. M. Stehle, 'Virgil's *Georgics*: The Threat of Sloth', *TAPA* 104 (1974) 359f., and W. Richter, *Vergil, Georgica* (München 1957) *ad. G.* 4.156f.

Durus amor (*G.* 3.259) conquered, there remains the problem of *dura mors* (*G.* 3.68). Apian resolutions emerge. The bees' indifference to their own individual deaths (203ff.) — service to the race is all — seems to procure vicarious, generic immortality: *genus immortale* (208). There are those too who regard apian immortality as not confined to the surrogate:

his quidam signis atque haec exempla secuti
esse apibus partem diuinae mentis et haustus
aetherios dixere; deum namque ire per omnis
terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum;
hinc pecudes, armenta, uiros, genus omne ferarum,
quemque sibi tenuis nascentem arcessere uitas:
scilicet huc reddi deinde ac resoluta referri
omnia, nec morti esse locum, sed uiua uolare
sideris in numerum atque alto succedere caelo.

(*G.* 4.219-27)

Following these signs and instances some have said
That bees have a share of divine intelligence
And draughts of ether; for god, they say, pervades all
Lands, and the ocean's reaches and the deep sky;
From him cattle, herds, men, every tribe of beasts,
Each at birth derive the subtle breath of life;
To him indeed all things at last return and, dissolved,
Are taken back; no place for death, but alive they fly
To the ranks of stars and ascend the soaring heaven.

The phraseology of the third georgic's double apocalypse is echoed (*cf. G.* 4.223 with *G.* 3.480, 242f.) with dialectical purpose.

Caution must be observed. A social model of the *labor-fructus* ideal, the bee community's fragility is conspicuous. The initial focus (8-115) on dangers that threaten the hive, on apian *discordia*,[64] on the need for man's protection and intervention, the concluding focus (239-80) on dangers to the hive and the problem of bees' disease point to this fragility, to the community's weakness as a utopia. Not only fragile, it is remote from normal experience,[65] as the reference to its unique and miraculous nature (*cf.* 153, 197) and as the concluding passage on participation in the divine mind indicate. The fact that the bee society provides in some thinkers' eyes (*quidam*, 219) — but not in Virgil's[66] — the basis for a theory of apian communion with the *diuina mens*

[64] It should not be forgotten that bees 'are militaristic little creatures whose propensity for violence needs to be firmly checked by the apiarist (*G.* IV. 67 ff.)': so Davis [62] 29.

[65] The remoteness of the bee community from particularly Roman experience is finely conveyed by the use of *Quirites* (the technical term for Roman citizens, not used elsewhere in the *Georgics* — but note *arma Quirini*, *G.* 3.27) in the very passage (*G.* 4.197-202) in which the bees' most non-Roman, indeed non-human activity is described: asexual propagation of the species.

[66] The theory here explicitly attributed to *quidam* ('some men', 219) cannot — despite traditional accounts to the contrary (e.g. Wilkinson [2] 123 f.) — be held by Virgil for two reasons:

highlights its paranormal nature and seems to place its social realisation of the second georgic's ideal so decidedly in the area of the atypical that its role as human civic paradigm is already questioned. Even in the terms in which the apian model is described its transference to the human world, the implementation of the principles of concord and selfless *labor* in human society itself, seems but a distant possibility.[67]

In the second half of the fourth georgic this scepticism is confirmed and confirmed in an episode — the Aristaeus epyllion (315-558) — in which the concerns of the first three and a half books of the poem are translated directly to the human sphere and the secondary language of animal and agricultural symbolism replaced with the primary language of human paradigm.[68] The opening picture of *pastor* Aristaeus, denied the fruits of toil, resigning the glory of his mortal life, which his skilful guardianship of field and flock had scarce wrought (*extuderat*, 328) for all his unwearied effort (*omnia temptanti*, 328), recalls the dying bull episode of *Georgic* 3 (515-30)[69] and brings to the reader's critical notice once more a disparity between work and reward patently at odds with the *labor-fructus* ideal.[70] The productive life of *labor* exhibited by the bee community, the Saturnian existence of fruitful toil proclaimed at the close of *Georgic* 2 and freshly articulated in the old Corycian parable of *Georgic*

firstly, because at *G.* 1.415 ff. the poet goes out of his way to proclaim on his own behalf a denial of the *diuinitus* theory of remarkable animal behaviour; secondly (and more importantly), because Books 1-3 and the second half of Book 4 portray the real world as one of chaos, injustice, suffering, death and disintegration — a world patently not permeated by divine intelligence.

[67] See also now Miles [3] 245-52, who argues for 'the utter inappropriateness of Jupiter's bees as models for humans'.

[68] Servius, as is well known, states (*ad E.* 10.1) that the whole of the second half of *Georgic* 4 (*a medio usque ad finem*) was changed after the death of Gallus (who committed suicide in 27 or 26 B.C.), the Aristaeus story (or, *ad G.* 4.1, the Orpheus story) replacing an earlier *laudes Galli.* The controversy has been much discussed and is now a dead issue: see Otis' excellent account [2] 408-13. Otis 412 f. points out that 250 or so lines eulogising Gallus would have been 'incredible and false to the spirit and balance of the *Georgics* as a whole', but suggests that there may have been 10-20 lines (at most) in praise of Gallus (and possibly also a few other lines concerned with Egypt) which were later omitted — I would add, or excised (Servius says that the change was made 'at the orders of Augustus', *iubente Augusto*). See also C.P. Segal, 'Orpheus and the fourth Georgic: Vergil on Nature and Civilization', *AJP* 87 (1966) 309, who supports Otis' view. Certainly the intricate thematic relationship between the Aristaeus epyllion and *Georgics* 1-3 and the first half of *Georgic* 4 cannot be accidental, and any hypothesis which regards the Aristaeus-Orpheus episode as anything other than an integral constituent of a completed poem slanders both the poem and the poet. As also does Wilkinson's reductive view [2] 120 f. of the epyllion: 'a suitable ending for a book on bees'.

[69] It recalls too, of course, the justification of *labor* in *Georgic* 1: *extuderat*, *G.* 4.328; *extunderet*, *G.* 1.133. The only other occurrence in the *Georgics* of this uncommon Virgilian word is at the beginning of this episode: *extudit artem*, *G.* 4.315, a phrase which itself recalls Book 1's Theodicy (*extunderet artis*, *G.* 1.133).

[70] On the relationship between Aristaeus' opening plight and the dying bull episode of *Georgic* 3 and their role in posing 'the Job question' see D.S. Wender, 'Resurrection in the Fourth Georgic', *AJP* 90 (1969) 426 f. The relationship is not seen by Miles [3] 258 ff.

4, are signally absent from this initial scene. The devastating *morbus* of Book 3 (*G*. 3.478, etc.; *cf. G*. 4.318) is not. In the Arcadian shepherd's experience — and both 'Arcadian' (*Arcadii*, 283) and 'shepherd' (*pastor*, 317) intimate that the tenuous vision of the *Eclogues* too is at stake — nature's munificence appears less a datum, more an enigma.

The cause of Aristaeus' plight, at first obscure, is eventually revealed. The oracular Proteus explains the apian loss as punishment for Aristaeus' fatal pursuit of Eurydice (453-59), which, as the weeping nymphs and landscape testify (460-63), violated his kinship with nature. The story, absent from earlier extant literature — it may be the poet's own invention — enables Virgil to link Aristaeus' initial frustration, dissolution, the failure of *labor* with passion's nullifying tyranny. The *labor-amor* antithesis of the first halves of Books 3 and 4 is thus restated but in a specifically *human* context, which focusses on that aspect of man's nature which he does not share with the bee community and which acts as an impediment to the fulfilment of the *labor-fructus* ideal at both the individual and social levels: his vulnerability to sexual *amor*, or, in more general terms, his vulnerability to the perverting and disintegrating passional forces of which the human personality is at least in part endemically constituted, and of which sexual *amor* is a paradigm.[71]

This antithesis between *labor* and *amor*, work and passion, success and man's chaotic, contra-rational nature, which the plight of Aristaeus reveals, is not restricted to the life of agricultural toil which the Arcadian master suggests. Intended to apply to the world of human *labor* per se, it is given detailed and dramatic demonstration in the area of Virgil's other main exemplar of creative human *labor*, song,[72] poignantly illustrated in the story of Orpheus' ineffectual

[71] There is a deliberate contrast here with the non-tragic, indeed comic effect of *amor* in the fairy-tale world of Olympus (*G*. 4.345-47).

[72] The analogy between Aristaeus and Orpheus in respect of the frustration of *labor* is missed by A. Bradley, 'Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative: Vergil's *Georgics*', *Arion* 8 (1969) 347-58, who views Aristaeus as a god of the repressive work-culture and Orpheus as representative of liberating, anti-*labor* forces. Bradley crucially ignores, *inter alia*, the fact that Virgil regards both Orpheus' poetry and his own as forms of *labor* — Orpheus: *G*. 4.492; Virgil: *G*. 2.39, *G*. 4.6; *cf. E*. 10.1 (Virgil), 64 (Gallus). A similar and similarly crucial error is made by Stehle [63] 368, who contrasts the 'instinctive song' of Orpheus which is 'not art' — 'there is no *labor* involved' — with the *ars* ascribed to Aristaeus, which is 'accomplished with labor and piety'. See also Segal [68] 316: 'His Orpheus' task as poet is not work, but beauty'. It does not help, however, to regard both Aristaeus and Orpheus as 'artists': so Putnam [3] 276ff. Certainly husbandry is an *ars* (*G*. 1.122, 133, 145, 174), a skill or series of skills which need to be learnt and mastered. But to have mastered the 'art' of farming or to carry out a series of instructions and thus 'discover' a technical *ars*, viz. the bugonic *ars*, is not at all the same as to be an artist. Nor is it even the case that Virgil uses the word *ars* in connection with both Aristaeus and Orpheus. Indeed not once on the forty-eight occasions in his poetic *œuvre* that Virgil uses the word *ars* does he apply it to poetry or song (the list of *artes* and *munera* which Apollo offers to Iapyx at *A*. 12.393f., viz. augury, the lyre and swift arrows, hardly constitute an exception). In the *Eclogues*, where Virgil overtly discusses poetry and song far more than in either of the other two works, the word does not occur. Calling

attempt to regain the lost Eurydice[73] — an attempt which designedly, as in the framing narrative itself (the climactic nature of the epyllion is thus further underlined), involves man's direct confrontation with the third georgic's other principal ingredient of sentient experience: death, its arbitrary or at least amoral dissolution. All Orpheus' efforts to conquer the irresistible finality of death (464-84), all the magical power of his song, are nullified by his inability to control his own passion, his *amor*, obliterated by his emblematic humanity (485-93). As Book 1 of the *Georgics* had disclosed, effort, *labor*, if it is to be effective, requires an intelligent, controlled and controlling mind; but, unlike the bees, whose toil is accompanied by no suspension of thought (they are *memores*, 'mindful', 156), the human *exemplum*, Orpheus, abandoning both care and thought (488, 491), is overcome by the irrational and dislocating *dementia/furor* of sexual love (488, 495). The frustration of his effort, the nullification of his *labor* — *omnis effusus labor*, 'all his labour was lost' (491f.) — , the annulment of all that the magical power of his song had achieved are brought about by his failure to subdue the passional constituents of his own humanity.

The sense of waste is immense. Virgil's empathetic handling of the story ensures that Orpheus, the poet *par excellence*, the incarnation of the virtues of courage, love, devotion and creative power, provides a potent illustration not only of individual human failure, dissolution and loss, but of their inherent, irreversible tragedy, the vast impoverishment of human life engendered by death's premature abortion of man's creative and moral potential. Immense, the waste undermines. Pitted against the gossamer promise of the bee community with its lack of sexual *amor* (197f.), its indifference to individual apian loss (203ff.), its surrogate (some would claim, 219ff., 'actual') triumph over death (208f.), the human actuality and tragedy of individual failure and nullification compel disquiet. Dissidence between social model and individual reality, adumbrated in the *Eclogues*, to be examined at length in the *Aeneid*, is unconcealed.

Tragic dissolution is but the beginning. The injustice of Orpheus' fate, hence of man's existential context, is marked. Proteus' initial pronouncement of the undeservedness of Orpheus' fate — *haudquaquam ob meritum*, [74] 'in no way

---

both Orpheus and Aristaeus 'artists' blurs important differences between the two, while not emphasising the most important thing which connects their distinct, creative activities: *labor*.

[73] The story of Orpheus' second loss of Eurydice, like the account of Aristaeus' involvement in her death, is not found in extant pre-Virgilian literature. See Otis [22] 58. Again Virgil seems to be inventing his version of the myth, or choosing to adopt a rare variant of it from a pre-Virgilian source now lost.

[74] The reading of all mss. but P, and the reading of Priscian and Servius. It is adopted in the Mynors 1972 Oxford text and the Geymonat 1973 Paravia edition. Reiske, Ribbeck and Hirtzel read *ad* for *ob*: so P.

because of his deserts' (455) — is reinforced by the concern with cruelty (495), pitilessness (492), lack of clemency (470, 488f.) in the underworld itself. As at the end of *Georgic* 3, death's arbitrary, pitiless, irresistible annihilation of man — an arbitrariness, pitilessness, and irresistibility all the more insistent because almost overcome — is emphatic:

iamque pedem referens casus euaserat omnis,
redditaque Eurydice superas ueniebat ad auras
pone sequens (namque hanc dederat Proserpina legem),
cum subita incautum dementia cepit amantem,
ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes:
restitit, Eurydicenque suam iam luce sub ipsa
immemor, heu, uictusque animi respexit. ibi omnis
effusus labor atque immitis rupta tyranni
foedera, terque fragor stagnis auditus Auernis.

(*G.* 4.485-93)

And now retracing his steps he had avoided every danger,
And Eurydice, regained, was nearing the upper air,
Following (for this condition Proserpina had made),
When sudden derangement seized the thoughtless lover —
Pardonable in fact, did the Dead know how to pardon.
He stopped, and, Eurydice his, even on the fringe of light
Forgot and, overwhelmed, looked back. Then was all
His labour lost, the pitiless tyrant's pact
Broken; a triple crash was heard in the pools of Avernus.

The harshness and brutishness of Orpheus' second loss is underlined by the emotive nightingale simile of 511ff., unequivocal in its implications:[75]

qualis populea maerens philomela sub umbra
amissos queritur fetus, quos durus arator
obseruans nido implumis detraxit; at illa
flet noctem, ramoque sedens miserabile carmen
integrat, et maestis late loca questibus implet.

(*G.* 4.511-15)

He wept — like a nightingale mourning beneath a poplar's shade,
Lamenting her lost young, which the heartless ploughman
Saw and dragged down from their nest unfledged: she weeps

[75] Putnam [3] 308-14 sees Virgil as distancing the reader from Orpheus in the final section of Proteus' narrative (507-27), presenting Orpheus' 'relinquishment of sexuality' (p. 309) as excessive. But it is hardly a question of a 'commitment to the non-erotic', to use Putnam's phrase (p. 308); Orpheus is totally distraught and still deeply in love as his final plangent cry for Eurydice shows (525-27). Nor is his devotion to Eurydice portrayed as excessive. His effect on, and union with, nature is still maintained (510), while the comparison with the nightingale (511-15) both establishes his grief as 'natural' and draws us toward, rather distances us from, his suffering — as do the final lines themselves (525-27), which echo in the memory long after the poem has been put down. It hardly needs saying that in those final lines the rapport with nature is still evident (*Eurydicen toto referebant flumine ripae*, ' "Eurydice" the banks echoed all down the stream', 527).

Through the night and, perched on a bough, repeats her piteous dirge,
Filling the places around with doleful lamentation.

Even Orpheus' rejection of alternative marriage-ties proves disastrous; repeating his deathly role of Book 3 (509-14), Bacchus, the idealising second georgic's munificent wine-god (see esp. *G.* 2.380-96), drives the Ciconian mothers to tear the singer's body limb from limb and scatter it over the fields (520-22). The preoccupation of the earlier books with the brutish amorality of man's context, its imperviousness to considerations of justice, desert or compassion, receives a final and finalising statement.[76]

And then there is the question of poetry's failure, or rather the failure of the poet himself. In the *Eclogues* Orpheus, like Hesiod, had functioned as a paradigm of poetry's power, a mythic symbol of the ideal of poetry's efficacy (*E.* 3.46, *E.* 4.55, *E.* 6.30, *E.* 8.56); his singing could even charm (and in *Eclogue* 3 is represented as charming) the forests to follow him. But just as Gallus in *Eclogue* 6 is associated with the ideal of poetry's efficacy only to fail in *Eclogue* 10 to realise it and fail to realise it because of the *furor* of sexual passion, so Orpheus, in the *Eclogues* a mythic illustration of poetry's power, in *Georgic* 4 fails to realise that power and fails to realise it because of the *furor* of sexual love. The failure of Gallus at the end of the *Eclogues* betokened Virgil's scepticism about the efficacy of song, betokened too the grounds for that scepticism: man's inability to control the passional constituents of his humanity; the failure of Orpheus at the end of the *Georgics* points to the continuing presence of this scepticism and its grounds in Virgil's mind.[77] The conjunction of human failure and human *furor* at the end of the *Aeneid*, which many critics even in recent times have found surprising or embarassing or (worse) insignificant, is amply foreshadowed. It is of more than peripheral import that like Orpheus' magical singing (*G.* 4.492), like Gallus' attempt to

[76] Contrast Otis [2] 213, for whom the Aristaeus epyllion shows 'man ... at the centre of a vast network of cosmic sympathy and moral law. There is both *iustitia* and *humanitas* at the heart of things'. Otis in fact recants this 'Augustan moralism' interpretation in his review of Wilkinson's book: [22] 56 f.

[77] G. B. Conte, 'Introduzione', *Virgilio Georgiche*, Testo, traduzione e note a cura di A. Barchiesi (Milano 1980) XXVI ff., regards Orpheus' failure as presenting only the failure of 'la poesia d'amore', while Aristaeus' success represents the superiority of 'poesia georgica'. There is nothing whatsoever in the text to suggest this. Aristaeus' 'success' rather than being connected with poetry is made to have overt ramifications for politics; while it would be extremely odd if Orpheus, paradigm in the Graeco-Roman tradition (*cf.* e.g. Horace *A.P.* 391 ff.) and specifically in the *Eclogues* of effective song *per se*, whose song in the *Georgics* is presented as affecting nature and even death itself, should be chosen simply to illustrate 'la poesia d'amore'. And it would be even odder if Virgil wanted a contrast between such disparate paradigms as song and agriculture to illustrate a contrast within one of them. Nor is it the case, as Conte XXVIII remarks, that Orpheus' poetry is simply 'una modalità contemplativa' and 'separata dall' azione'. On the contrary, Orpheus' poetry is *labor* itself and effective labor too. It is rendered vain by Orpheus' own humanity.

conquer *amor* (*E.* 10.64), like the tenth eclogue and the *Georgics* themselves (*E.* 10.1; *G.* 2.39, *G.* 4.116), Aeneas' mission itself is a paradigm of *labor* (*cf.* esp. *A.* 12.435).

But — it might be argued — the fourth georgic also provides ground for hope. If the artist fails, the farmer succeeds; there can perhaps be comfort in that. In pointed contrast to Orpheus' grim journey into Tartarus, Aristaeus' journey into the nether regions of the sea is transparently successful:[78] loss yields to reparation, suffering to triumph, ignorance to knowledge, death to regeneration. The ramifications are crucial. Paradigm of agricultural toil, Aristaeus, like the farmer in Book 1 (cf. esp. *magna ui*, *G.* 1.169; *uis humana*, *G.* 1.198), achieves success through the constructive employment of violence upon nature (not to speak of the slaughter of the bulls and heifers, note the emphasis on the necessity to use violence on the nature god, Proteus: *ui*, *G.* 4.398; *uim duram*, *G.* 4.399; *ui ... multa*, *G.* 4.450);[79] while the regeneration of his bees (or, to be more accurate, the creation of a new race of bees: *genus nouae stirpis*, *G.* 4.282) constitutes a triumph over death, albeit generic and apian, and one which seems to act as some sort of precursorial symbol of the socio-political regeneration of Rome itself — the analogy between Aristaeus' 'atonement' and that of Rome at the end of *Georgic* 1 suggests the latter (*cf.* *luis*, 'you atone', *G.* 4.454, with *luimus*, 'we have atoned', *G.* 1.502; there are no other instances of this word in the *Georgics*), as does the political epilogue which follows.[80] Nor is Orpheus' tragedy without its positive, beneficent aspect. Its instrumentality in generating the bugonic art (and the πάθει μάθος doctrine of the first georgic is explicitly recalled — *cf.* *G.* 4.315 with *G.* 1.133)[81] seems to intimate that even unjust and pitiless suffering may generate human good.

[78] The two journeys (359-73, 467-84) are clearly intended to be compared and have several verbal as well as thematic affinities. But note that, while Orpheus stupefies (*commotae*, 471; *stupuere*, 481), Aristaeus is stupefied (*mirans*, 373; *stupefactus*, 365). Orpheus' success, however, proves momentary.

[79] In stark contrast Orpheus and Eurydice are victims of violence from nature and man (*G.* 4.456-59, 511-13, 520-22). Aristaeus' violence, of course, can be seen as emblematic of 'successful' man's relationship with his evironment. But it needs to be observed that it is precisely because of this aspect of his behaviour that human death and suffering occur, that Orphic song is extinguished and Aristaeus' own loss generated. This is not however to say with Perkell [61] 215f. that what Aristaeus is atoning for is man's necessity to 'commit aggression against nature in order to make it productive for his own purposes'. Aristaeus is atoning for a particular act of violence (the pursuit, attempted rape even of Eurydice) with particular consequences, the deaths of Orpheus and Eurydice, to which nature responds (460-63, 532ff.).

[80] *Cf.* Otis [2] 213: 'Aristaeus' story seems to suggest the sinful self-destruction, atonement and revival of the Roman people'. Otis, however, misses the relevance in this connection of a number of obvious parallels between Aristaeus and Caesar (for which see n. 90 below).

[81] There is even a brief glimpse of this doctrine in the description of the Noric cattle-plague at the end of *Georgic* 3 (558).

Such hope, however, seems not to be at the centre of Virgil's presentment.[82] The doubtful value of the bugonic art and the irony of the association of bugonic fantasy (*dictu mirabile monstrum*, 'a portent miraculous to tell', *G.* 4.554) with socio-political rebirth suggest in themselves little ground for optimism.[83] The narrative and descriptive imperatives of the epyllion confirm this. For not only is the description of the Aristaean *bugonia* in no sense triumphal — a sparse narrative (547-58) lists remorseless acts,[84] arresting the attention momentarily with images, not of joyful rebirth, but of 'putrified

---

[82] Contrary to R. R. Dyer, 'Ambition in the *Georgics*: Vergil's Rejection of Arcadia', in B. F. Harris (ed.), *Auckland Classical Essays Presented to E. M. Blaiklock* (Auckland 1971) 158: 'Vergil intends that our compassion and admiration of Orpheus' brilliant failure should be overshadowed by the success of Aristaeus' dedication in surviving disaster and becoming the recipient of divine love made manifest in miraculous *benefacta*'. Nor is Dyer alone: see, for example, Mountford [31] 31, Conte [77] xxv ff., and Stehle [63] 369 — for Stehle in the Aristaeus epyllion 'Virgil points the way to salvation'. Even Putnam [3] 11-16, 320 f., who offers 'a more pessimistic representation' of the poem than others, takes a more positive attitude to Aristaeus' achievement than Virgil's narrative seems to warrant: 'Aristaeus survives where Orpheus, paradigm of poets, does not, because he can balance his humanness with his immortal pedigree so as to exert mind on matter and create an additional form of art that brightens our world' (p. 321). It is difficult to see how Aristaeus, whose only stated mental responses are grief (319, 350, 355 f., 375), stupefaction (363, 365), lust (457) and fear (530), who carries out the orders of Cyrene without any mental or other delay (*haud mora: continuo matris praecepta facessit*, 548), who needs an interpreter for Proteus' oracle (530 ff.), whose path to 'success' is through violence, can properly be described in this way. Nor is there any suggestion in the Aristaeus epyllion that the bugonic art 'brightens our world'. It would have been simple for Virgil to describe the restoration of Aristaeus' bees (548-58) in a way which suggested this. He does not. The value of the bugonic art seems in fact far from certain (see n. 83 below).

[83] Attested by Greek authorities (including Nicander), *bugonia* was nevertheless treated with less than total credulity by Roman writers. It is mentioned in Varro (*R.R.* 3.16.4) — in a speech by one of the characters of the third book, Appius Claudius — as one of two ways in which bees are born (*nascuntur*); but after 'support' is adduced in the form of two quotations from Archelaus, the second of which maintains also that 'wasps are generated from horses', the matter is duly forgotten. *Bugonia* is conspicuous for its absence from the ensuing discourse on practical beekeeping by Lucius Merula (*R.R.* 3.16.10-38), for whom the actual business of 'reviving' (*reuiuescunt*) bees — afflicted by rain or cold — calls for a method more practical and mundane (*R.R.* 3.16.37-38). The other allusion to *bugonia* in Varro is perhaps even more interesting. At *R.R.* 2.5.5 it is included in a list of (otherwise?) mythological stories associated with the ox (Jupiter changed into the animal; it protected the sons of Neptune; it spoke in Latin). Nor is Columella any more convincing on the subject: at 9.14.6 he mentions the bugonic method only to decline to deal with it (on the grounds that there is never such mortality among bees). For *bugonia* occasioning scepticism among the ancients, see Perkell [61], for whom 'The effect of crediting Aristaeus, the culture hero, with this uncertain and ambiguous process of contriving life out of death is ... to question, to place in doubt the value or validity of cultural achievements' (p. 219).

[84] Aristaeus manifests not the least remorse for the tragedies of Eurydice and Orpheus (contrast the lamentation over the loss of his bees). His only emotional response is fear (*timentem*, 530), and it seems not accidental (see C.P. Segal, 'The Magic of Orpheus and the Ambiguities of Language', *Ramus* 7 [1978] 126) that Cyrene's mention of supplication and the request for pardon and peace (534-36) are omitted in the description of the acts. Similarly there is no mention of Eurydice (547). Miles' suggestion [3] 289, that Aristaeus learns 'to respect the tragic circumstances of human existence', is utterly without foundation.

entrails' (*liquefacta ... uiscera*, 555), 'smashed ribs' (*ruptis ... costis*, 556), and the 'buzzing' (*stridere*, 556) and 'seething' (*efferuere*, 556) of bees — but in contrast to the account of the Egyptian *bugonia* prior to the Aristaeus epyllion itself (see esp. 303-14)[85] it seems almost perfunctory.[86] The true focal point of the epyllion — emotively, structurally, thematically, poetically — is clearly Proteus' oracular tale, the dense, elliptical, empathetic style of which seems intended to contrast sharply with the leisurely, objective and Homeric style of the framing Aristaeus narrative.[87] And Proteus — it should not be forgotten — like Homer's Calchas (*Iliad* 1.70) and Hesiod's Muses (*Theog.* 38) possesses universal knowledge (392f.): a fact which both associates his narrative with Virgil's Hesiodic ideal (and thus with Ascraean Virgil himself) and endows it with the status of an existential paradigm.[88] It is thus not only to Orpheus' suffering that the reader's attention is drawn, to the tragedy and undeservedness of his fate, but to the significance of that fate, to man's failure, impotence, vulnerability, to his tragic, arbitrary individual nullification as cardinal to the structure of things, to the brutishness, pitilessness, injustice or at least amorality of his world, to the darkness of his environment and his experience of it, and to the failure of poetry to lift him from that darkness into the shining light. The pessimism is transparent, existential and poetic.[89]

---

[85] Note also in the Egyptian *bugonia* Virgil's focus on the individual suffering preceding bugonic triumph (299-302). The individual loss, however, receives less attention or emphasis than the *bugonia* itself — a situation to be reversed in the emblematic narrative which follows.

[86] Despite Putnam's brave attempt [3] 318 to interpret it 'as a mark of signal importance' that 'Virgil devotes sixteen lines to Cyrene's description of the sacrifices Aristaeus must offer and to the hero's explicit implementation of her request'. After seventy-five lines of Virgil's most empathetic poetry (453-527) those sixteen lines seem decidedly anticlimactic.

[87] See Otis' excellent analysis of the stylistic contrasts at issue [2] 193 ff. *Cf.* also J. Griffin, 'The Fourth *Georgic*, Virgil, and Rome', *G&R* n.s. 26 (1979) 70 f.

[88] It seems to accord with the far-reaching import of Proteus' oracle that Aristaeus is given little individualisation, but through analogies with the heroic figures of Achilles (*cf. G.* 4.319 ff., 333 f., with *Iliad* 1.349 ff., 18.35 ff.), Menelaus (*cf. G.* 4.387 ff. with *Od.* 4.382 ff.), and possibly Theseus (see A. Wankenne, 'Aristée et Orphée dans les Géorgiques', *LEC* 38 [1970] 20) is endowed with an archetypal, representative quality suitable to his role as the recipient of the apocalypse of *humana uita* which the Orpheus narrative constitutes. On the Orpheus saga as human paradigm see Segal [68] 311 f.: 'Vergil means us to sympathize deeply with Orpheus as we do not with Aristaeus. It is not just that tragedy is more moving than success, but that the sufferings of Orpheus touch upon the greater complexities of the human condition and hence raise deeper questions'.

[89] F. Klingner, *Virgils Georgica* (Zurich and Stuttgart 1963) 234 ff., contends that the tragedy and death of the Orpheus story has to be balanced by the pantheism of *G.* 4.219-27, which suggests — according to Klingner — that individual suffering and annihilation are redeemed and absorbed into a higher order of things: 'Locker endeutend, lässt er [Virgil] bei Gelegenheit einer höher weisenden Eigenschaft der Bienen ein tröstliches Welt — und Gottesgeheimnis aufscheinen, worin Qual, Not, Krankheit und Tod aller irdischen Wesen, all das, was im dritten Buch unerlöst gelastet hat, sich auflöst, aufgehoben in einer göttlichen Ordnung' (p. 235). Apart from the structural imbalance resulting from this thesis, Klingner's position ignores the following: 1. Virgil does not subscribe to the theory of *G.* 4.219-27 — see n. 66 above; 2. There is no reference either to the passage or to the theory of pantheism in the Aristaeus epyllion itself, although the epyllion is the

Paradox and Intent

The paradox of the *Georgics* demands scrutiny. The *Eclogues*' pessimistic attitude to the socio-moral possibilities of human life, to human *furor* and human failure as intrinsic ingredients of human experience, permeates the didactic substance of the poem and receives a wide-ranging and confirming metaphysical basis; it culminates, like the *Eclogues* themselves, in an illustration of poetry's failure. Elsewhere in the *Georgics* — in the politico-historical frame of the poem and in the *Laudes Italiae* of Book 2 — the earlier work's denigration of the political world and its scepticism about the possibility of poetry's efficacy appear signally reversed. Climaxing the parade of Roman and military heroes with his claim to sing an Ascraean song, Virgil seems to suggest both the efficacy of his poetry and the civilising, ordering, morally enriching possibilities — possibilities apparently being realised — of the politico-military world.

What is the intended relationship in the finished poem of the constituents of this strange conjunction of existential/poetic pessimism and exhibited political/poetic fervour? The intended relationship seems *structurally* to be one of subsumption. That is to say, the basic structure of the poem — framework of political eulogy and poetic fervour, parts clearly linked and interdependent, encompassing statement of existential and poetic pessimism — seems designed to invite an interpretation of the latter's subsumption by the former: the poem implying architecturally, as it were, that the wretchedness of the human context, if normally preclusive of human hope, may yet be subsumed within the morally, politically and poetically regenerative fact of Caesar. Like Lucretius' deified hero (*DRN.* 3.1f.), to whom, as in *Eclogue* 5 (*cf. E.* 5.64 and *DRN.* 5.8), obvious allusion is made (*cf.* esp.: *G.* 1.24ff. and *DRN.* 5.8; *G.* 3.4f. and *DRN* 5.22ff.; *G.* 2.171, *G.* 3.27, *G.* 4.562f. and *DRN.* 1.72-79), Caesar may make the darkness into light.

Other structural considerations seem to point in this direction: the transparent relationship, for example, of the politically eulogistic sections to the despairing finale of Book 1, in which — in the midst of Virgil's fiery depiction of moral and political chaos — Caesar is made to figure as a faint source of hope ('faint' is important, for the reference to Octavian is overtly ambiguous and the tone essentially that of despair): the hope of the triumph of order over disorder, right over wrong, fruitfulness over destruction. The proems to

---

thematic climax of the book and indeed of the poem, taking up and bringing to a head the main themes of the preceding three and a half books; 3. There is nothing in the passage at *G.* 4.219ff. about redemption ('aufgehoben') of suffering or consolation ('tröstliches'); 4. The pantheism of *G.* 4.219ff. would have no effect on the crucial question of the amorality/injustice of the human existential context (which Virgil especially emphasises in the Orpheus saga) — apart, that is, from rendering it more puzzling than it is.

Book 1 and 3, the *Laudes Italiae* of Book 2, the epilogue to Book 4 seem clearly to reply to this hope, presenting in Caesar's political triumph and military victories its imminent or actual fulfilment. Similarly the position of the central eulogy of Caesar immediately after Virgil's articulation of the *labor-fructus* ideal in the finale to *Georgic* 2 (the two passages together form the centre of the work and are linked — in clear thematic counterpoint to the finale to *Georgic* 1 — by the image of the controlled chariot: *G.* 2.541f., *G.* 3.18; *cf. G.* 1.512-14) seems to suggest that through the agency of great Caesar, proclaimed here as a second Romulus (*G.* 3.27), the *labor-fructus* ideal can be realised despite the impediments to its fulfilment so meticulously and compellingly described. The focus in the proem to *Georgic* 1 on Caesar as an agricultural god, 'author of the crops and the seasons' lord', *auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem* (*G.* 1.27), strengthens this suggestion — as does the central eulogy's most arresting image: Caesarian temple in green fields (*uiridi in campo*, G. 3.13; also *G.* 3.14f.). Finally, the juxtaposition of the eulogistic epilogue to *Georgic* 4 with the regeneration theme of the Aristaeus epyllion (and the regeneration is of bees, the *Georgics*' model of the *labor-fructus* ideal in social operation) seems intended to suggest not only the moral regeneration of Rome under the leadership of Caesar, already presented as regenerative force (the 'new' Caesar, *G.* 1.503; the second Romulus, *G.* 3.27) — a suggestion reinforced by the analogy between Aristaeus' atonement (*G.* 4.454) and that of Rome (*G.* 1.502) and between Aristaeus himself and Caesar[90] — but also, because of the relationship of Aristaeus' success to Orpheus' tragedy, the subsumption of human tragedy and failure within a larger, socio-moral, even providential vision. Out of Orpheus' tragedy came regeneration and the development of human skill (*cf. G.* 4.315 with *G.* 1.133); out of human suffering and failure will come — or indeed is now come — the spiritual rebirth of Rome and the social implementation of concord, justice and compassion. The ideals of the *Eclogues* made reality by the achievements of Caesar in history, the values of

---

[90] Generally ignored, the following parallels between Aristaeus and Octavian seem transparent: divine descent (*G.* 4.315 ff., *G.* 3.35 f.) and association with Apollo (*G.* 4.323, *G.* 3.36 — and see n. 15 above); divine aspiration (*G.* 4.325, *G.* 4.562); conquest/success through violence (e.g., *G.* 4.398 ff., 450, *G.* 3.26 ff., *G.* 4.560 ff.); youth (*G.* 4.423, 445, *G.* 1.500); fame (*G.* 4.332, *G.* 3.46 ff.). Importantly both figure in the proem to the *Georgics*, invoked as deities to assist the poet in his task (*G.* 1.14 f., 24 ff.). No allegorical equation between Aristaeus and Caesar is, of course, thereby entailed — just sufficient points of coincidence to suggest (together with the other matters mentioned above) the relevance of the Aristaean saga to more immediate, more historical realities. Interestingly the political import of *bugonia* seems to be carried over into *Aeneid* 1, in which Carthage is presented as literally 'bugonic' (having originated from the tied strips of a bull's hide, *taurino ... tergo*, *A.* 1.368) and its people compared to the apian community in the organisation and fervour of their *labor* (*A.* 1.430-36; *cf. G.* 4.162 ff.). See E. W. Leach, '*Sedes Apibus*: From the *Georgics* to the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 23 (1977) 2-16, esp. 11. Worth noting also concerning the connection between Caesar and the Aristaean *bugonia* is the imagistic link between 'huge' apian 'clouds' (*immensas nubes*, *G.* 4.557; *cf. G.* 4.312) and Caesarian 'thunder' (*fulminat*, *G.* 4.561).

the poetic and the political worlds congruent, not opposed, a new sense of poetry's function, possibilities, didactic efficacy, when allied with the world of action and of history, follows almost inevitably. A revisionary poetics seems entailed.

Such seems to be the relationship between the ingredients of the *Georgics*' conjunction of eulogy and pessimism implied by the poem's structure. It proves — it seems to me intentionally — unsuccessful. The substantive pessimism of the poem seems too deep and too carefully and pervasively articulated to be subsumed in this way. The impediments to the fulfilment of the *labor-fructus* ideal, which Caesar is now suggested to be realising, and, related to this, the impediments to poetry's efficacy, are too realistically, forcefully and profoundly presented. They are not presented as historical accidents or chance events, but as constitutive features of animal and human experience, obdurate, irreducible elements of the structure of things, ineradicable ingredients of nature, man and the world, part — in Virgil's words — of nature's *aeterna foedera*, her 'eternal covenants' (*G.* 1.60). And if Aristaeus' bugonic success seems structurally intended to intimate the subsumption of human tragedy and failure in the spiritual regeneration of Rome, it fails to do so. Not to speak of the undermining irony of the association of bugonic salvation with contemporary Egypt (*omnis in hac certam regio iacit arte salutem*, 'the whole region rests on this art its sure salvation', *G.* 4.293) or of the disquiet arising from the dubious value of the bugonic art itself (reinforced by the explicit fantasy nature of Aristaeus' bugonic success: *G.* 4.554)[91] — the Arcadian shepherd's achievement, compared with the huge impoverishment of human life caused by the deaths and sufferings of Eurydice and Orpheus, appears paltry, insignificant.[92] Virgil's empathetic focus, his experiential emphasis in the concluding epyllion is not on how human tragedy can generate human good, but on the individual tragedy itself and on the existential context in which such tragedy is possible, on the cardinal facts of human impotence, vulnerability, dissolution and failure, on brutishness, pitilessness, injustice or at least amorality as endemic features of man's world, on the dark contours of the metaphysical framework of man's life and the darkness of his experience of it. No catalogue of accidental ills, the *Georgics*, as the manifold debts to Lucretius confirm,[93] unfolds the conditions of experience. It is Virgil's *De Rerum Natura.*

---

[91] See n. 83 above.

[92] A 'pale compensation' is Otis' more recent judgement [22] 56.

[93] Even the phrase *aeterna foedera* obviously recalls Lucretius: *foedera naturai*, *DRN.* 1.586, 2.302; *naturae foedera*, *DRN.* 5.310; *fati foedera*, *DRN.* 2.254; *foedere naturae*, *DRN.* 5.924, 6.906 f.

The conclusion which seems inescapable is that Virgil has deliberately created a structurally subsumptive relationship between the emotional and spiritual poles of his poem which proves unsuccessful at the deeper level of thought, poetry and presentment in order to furnish a dialectic between the socio-moral possibilities generated by Caesar and the brute realities of the existential context. Virgil seems in a sense to be thinking through ambivalent feelings about the contemporary possibilities for political, social and moral optimism (and by 'contemporary' is meant the eighteen month period after Actium, to which *all* the eulogies of Octavian can be dated — the finale to *Georgic* 1, which must be earlier, is no eulogy) by presenting the latter in juxtaposition with his articulated perception of nature's 'eternal covenants'.[94]

Reflected in the equivocal notion of Rome in the poem — the crown of all creation (*rerum ... pulcherrima Roma*, *G.* 2.534), heir to the values of Italy's golden past (*G.* 2.534-38), yet simultaneously the iron-lawed (*ferrea iura*, *G.* 2.501) cauldron of man's worst pursuits (esp. *G.* 2.495ff; *Romanae res*, *G.* 2.498), the fratricidal act of its foundation (*Remus et frater*, *G.* 2.533) perpetuated in the spiritual dislocation of its citizens — this ambivalence intrudes into the political eulogies themselves. The qualifications to the apotheotic laudations of the proem to *Georgic* 1 were noted earlier. To be observed now in respect of the proem to *Georgic* 3 is the contiguity of the proem's eulogy of 'the arms of victorious Romulus' (*G.* 3.27) to the sullen condemnation of war, emblem of postlapsarian man in the final lines of Book 2 (536-40) — a contextual irony underscored by the imagistic association of the poet and the poetic temple he will build to honour Caesar with the indices of urban artifice, excess and *contra naturam* values only recently condemned (*G.* 2.459ff., 495ff.).[95] 'Conspicuous in Tyrian purple' (*Tyrio conspectus in ostro*, *G.* 3.17; *cf. G.* 2.464f., 495, 506), erecting a temple of marble, its 'doors' inlaid with gold and ivory (*G.* 3.13, 26; *cf. G.* 2.461, 463f., 507), concerning himself with the clash of arms (*G.* 3.26ff.; *cf. G.* 2.459, 496), with war (*G.* 3.28), with the fall of cities and kingdoms (*G.* 3.30ff.; *cf. G.* 2.498, 503ff.), with the

---

[94] It is clear that my position runs counter to that of W. R. Johnson in his recent and stimulating essay, 'The Broken World: Virgil and his Augustus', *Arethusa* 14 (1981) 49-55, who maintains (p. 53) that 'in the *Georgics* the usual contradictions and oppositions of Virgil's poetry are gathered into luminous harmonies', 'the figure of Augustus' being part of the 'lyrical harmonies' of the poem and 'itself a principal instrument of those harmonies'.

[95] An association noted also now by Miles [3] 175ff., who fails however to observe the contextual irony of the stark *value* contrast. Miles' reduction of it to a 'change of perspective' supported by a different 'vision of human nature' (p. 177) misses the mark completely. It is Virgil's attitude to the socio-moral possibilities of the political world that is at issue here and Virgil's *ostensible* attitude, while at odds with that displayed in the denunciation of urban values at *G.* 2.461 ff., 485 ff., far from assuming yet another 'vision of human nature', is consonant with and a development of that already displayed in the proem to *Georgic* 1 and in the *Laudes Italiae* of *Georgic* 2.

destiny of Rome (*cf. Romanae res*, *G.* 2.498), the poet *qua* political, military panegyricist seems disturbingly close to the second georgic's paradigm of psychological, spiritual dislocation. Even Book 2's other concluding emblem of post-Saturnian impiety, 'slaughtered bullocks' (*caesis iuuencis*, *G.* 2.537), insinuates itself into the poet's Caesarian fantasy:

> iam nunc sollemnis ducere pompas
> ad delubra iuuat caesosque uidere iuuencos.
>
> (*G.* 3.22-23)
>
> Even now I rejoice to lead the ritual march
> To the altars and to see the slaughtered bullocks.

Aspects of Virgil's restatement of intended future poetic service to Octavian appear to mirror this same unease:

> mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
> Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos,
> Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.
>
> (*G.* 3.46-48)
>
> Yet soon I'll arm myself to tell Caesar's burning battles
> And bear his name in glory for as many years
> As separate Tithonus' distant birth from Caesar.

It seems not trivial that the imagery of fire and burning descriptive of Caesar's military achievements reappears later in *Georgic* 3 in direct association with the poem's two main disruptive forces in both animal and human experience: sexual *furor* and death. As the fire (*ignis*, 244; *ignem*, 258), flame (*flamma*, 271) and heat (*calor*, 272) of *amor* lead into the fiery thirst (*ignea sitis*, 482f.), the burning blisters (*ardentes papulae*, 564; *cf. ardentes oculi*, 505; *ardebant*, 512) and accursed fire (*sacer ignis*, 566) of the death-dealing plague, the overtly destructive implications of the imagery linking these twin pillars of dissolution underscore the suggestion that Quirinal Caesar's 'burning battles' may contain not only possibilities for good. Romulus after all, in whose triumphant image Caesar is portrayed (*G.* 3.27), was not only man become god, founder of Rome and protector of the city. He was Remus' brother (*G.* 2.533).

Similar ambivalences pervade the epilogue to *Georgic* 4:

> haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam
> et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
> fulminat Euphraten bello uictorque uolentis
> per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.
> illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
> Parthenope, studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
> carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,
> Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.
>
> (*G.* 4.559-66)
>
> Thus I sang on the care of fields and cattle
> And on trees, while great Caesar thundered in war

By deep Euphrates and, victorious, gave justice
Among willing nations, and began the path to Olympus.
At that time I, Virgil, was nourished by sweet Parthenope,
Blossoming in the pursuits of inglorious peace,
I who played shepherds' songs and emboldened by youth,
Tityrus, sang of you beneath spread of sheltering beech.

The attribution of Jove-like properties to Octavian, 'thundering in war' by the deep Euphrates, indicates the contemporary reality of post-Saturnian life. It intimates too the intrinsic ambivalence of Caesar's power: *Georgic* 1's 'lord of seasons' (*tempestatum potentem*, *G.* 1.27) is in retrospect also the 'lord of storms' (*cf.* *A.* 1.80),[96] wielder in war of the thunderbolt, Jupiter's instrument — as *Georgic* 1 revealed — not only of just conquest and suppression (*G.* 1.281-83) but also of arbitrary agricultural devastation (*G.* 1.328-34).[97] Intriguingly the language depicting the generation of Aristaeus' bees immediately prior to the epilogue itself seems not only to anticipate (*immensas nubes*, 'huge clouds' *G.* 4.557) Caesarian 'thunder' but to recall tangentially (*efferuere*, 'boil up', *G.* 4.556; *liquefacta*, 'putrified', 'molten', *G.* 4.555) the disaster-portending *signa* of *Georgic* 1 (specifically the eruption of Aetna: *efferuere*, *G.* 1.471; *liquefacta*, *G.* 1.473).[98] Indeed the connection between Caesar and the Aristaean bugonia seems almost overtly equivocal. The slaughter of bulls, source of apian generation (*G.* 4.538ff.; *caesa uitula*, *G.* 4.547; *caesis iuuencis*, *G.* 4.284) and constituent of Caesarian triumph (*caesos iuuencos*, *G.* 3.23), was enunciated emblem — at the poem's centre (*caesis iuuencis*, *G.* 2.537) — of postlapsarian man.[99]

There is more. If the epilogue's echo of Callimachus' poetics, his aversion to 'thundering' verse — 'It is not mine to thunder (βροντᾶν); that belongs to Zeus' (*Aetia* fr. 1.20 Pf.) — tantalises, the ostensible belittling of *otium* arrests. In the meditated contrast between thundering Caesar and self-disparaging poet, divine distributor of justice and youthful shepherds' bard, war's triumphant victor and nourished flower of peace, the unconvincing

---

[96] Nethercut [6] 43 takes 'lord of storms' to be the overt meaning of *tempestatum potentem* in *G.* 1.27. This seems mistaken. Elsewhere in the *Georgics tempestates* (*pace* Nethercut) never means 'storms' (see *G.* 1.252, 311), and even the singular, *tempestas*, certainly does not mean 'storm' in two of its four occurrences (*G.* 1.417; *b.* 3.479). The conjunction with *auctorem frugum* ('author of crops') and the welcoming reception by the *maximus orbis* ('mighty world', *G.* 1.26) seem to settle the matter as to its meaning in context. However, the epilogue's picture of thundering Caesar does infuse the expression with ambiguity *in retrospect* and thus *in retrospect* increase the ambivalence of the first book's proem. It is true that *tempestatum potentem* has the sense 'lord of storms' at *A.* 1.80 (of Aeolus), but there it is conjoined with *nimborum* ('storm-clouds') which elicits that sense.

[97] Nethercut [6] 44 and 50 n. 5 sees only the negative side of *fulminat*, omitting the thunderbolt's role as instrument of just suppression (*G.* 1.281-83).

[98] *Efferuere* does not occur elsewhere in the *Georgics* (or in Virgil); *liquefacta* only once elsewhere in the *Georgics*: *G.* 4.36 (of honey).

[99] For other links between Aristaeus and Octavian, see n. 90 above.

denigration of *otium*, central value of the *Eclogues*' pastoral ideal, loved by good Daphnis, fructifying hero-god of *Eclogue* 5 (*E*. 5.61) and spiritual model for Octavian in *Georgic* 1, loved by the *fortunati agricolae* of the *Georgics*' own spiritual vision (*secura quies*, *G*. 2.467; *otia*, *G*. 2.468), points, as perhaps do the Callimachean echoes themselves, through ideological rhetoric to paradox and uncertainty. Even the distribution of justice (*G*. 4.562) seems far from unambivalent; Roman *iura* — it is to be remembered — are sometimes made of iron (*ferrea iura*, *G*. 2.501), and Roman justice — the *Eclogues* had shown — sometimes verbal fiction. The concluding reference to the *Eclogues* in fact compels disquiet. Returning us to a world in which Daphnis-idealism (*E*. 5) and Caesarian reality are dissident (*E*. 9, *E*. 1), in which the profession of magnanimity and moral order by an urban *deus* coexists with arbitrary dissolution and suffering (*E*. 1), in which the spiritual polarity of the political and poetic worlds and the nullificatory impact of the former on the latter are affirmed and exhibited (esp. *E*. 1, *E*. 9, *E*. 10), the *Georgics*' enigmatic close seems to suggest more than sphragistic intent. In the final line's repetition of the *Eclogues*' opening verse the echoic Muse — index in Virgil's earlier vision of poetry's contemporary impotence — momentarily, perhaps signally, intrudes.[100] Orpheus' last words too (*G*. 4.525-27) were echoic.

Finally, manifesting something other than unqualified eulogy of Italy, Rome and Octavian — the *Laudes Italiae* themselves:[101]

> haec genus acre uirum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam
> adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volscosque uerutos
> extulit, haec Decios Marios magnosque Camillos,
> Scipiadas duros bello et te, maxime Caesar,
> qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris
> imbellem auertis Romanis arcibus Indum.
> salue, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
> magna uirum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artis
> ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis,
> Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.
>
> (*G*. 2.167-76)

---

[100] On the *Eclogues*' 'echoic Muse' see pp. 33-35 above and further A.J. Boyle, 'Virgil's Pastoral Echo', *Ramus* 6 (1977) 121-31.

[101] For a vigorous and important investigation of ambivalence in the *Laudes Italiae* see M.C.J. Putnam, 'Italian Virgil and the Idea of Rome', *Janus: Essays in Ancient and Modern Studies*, ed. L.L. Orlin (Ann Arbor 1975) 171-99. Putnam takes the case for negativity much further than I would, raising what I see as latent paradox to the level — it seems to me — of severe criticism. Miles [3] 119-29, on the other hand, sees no ambivalence at all. Curiously he argues 126 f. that the choice of military heroes at *G*. 2.169 f. is designed to exclude (with the exception of Caesar) 'major figures in the civil wars', restricting itself to 'defenders of Italy who, with the exception of the young Caesar, had gained their reputations by 146 B.C.' The word *Marii* (*G*. 2.169) shows this to be nonsense.

This land has borne a vigorous breed of men,
Marsians and Sabine stock, the Ligurian used to hardship
And Volscian spearmen; she the Decii, Marii and great Camilli,
The Scipios hard in war and you, greatest of all, Caesar,
Who now — already victorious on Asia's furthest shores —
Turn the war-worthless Indian far from the citadels of Rome.
Hail, great mother of crops, land of Saturn,
Great mother of men; for you I attempt the theme
Of ancient glory and art, I dare to unseal our holy springs
And sing through Roman towns an Ascraean song.

The preceding allusions to the *bellator equus* (*G.* 2.145) and the militaristic Portus Iulius (*G.* 2.161-64), whose construction caused the protesting shrieks of ocean (*indignatum ... aequor*, *G.* 2.162),[102] are brought to a climax in this stirring catalogue of Italy's most famous warriors, the conjunction of which with the enunciation of Italy's Saturnian status, its proclaimed realisation of golden age peace and plenty, exhibits beneath surface eulogy latent and disquieting paradox: armed men mothered by a golden land of peace. The paradox — not lessened by the covert irony that it is perhaps Rome's enemy, the *imbellis Indus*, who possesses the pre-Dictaean attribute of peace[103] — infects the Ascraean claim itself. It is to Italy qua *Saturnia tellus* that Virgil sings his song. Iron-age reality (to which *Ascraeum* itself might indirectly refer)[104] enters, challenges, threatens. Dependent on the restoration of the kingdom of Saturn in his own time, on the implementation of the values of the *labor-fructus* ideal in and by the Caesarian world, on the spiritual regeneration of Rome and the *Romana oppida* through which he sings his song, Virgil's

[102] On *indignatum* see Putnam [101] 185-87. *Cf.* the shield's final image of *indignatus Araxes* (*A.* 8.728) and the *Aeneid's* final focus on Turnus' 'protesting life' (*uita indignata*, *A.* 12.952; cf. *A.* 11.831).

[103] 'Covert irony' and 'perhaps' are important. Putnam [101] 175 seems to exaggerate and mislead when he says: 'Virgil reserves his *severest* irony for the word *imbellem*. Octavian, the mighty victor, warding off Rome's enemies from her heights, is expending his efforts on someone who is *innately unwarlike*' (my emphasis). *Imbellis* = 1. 'war-worthless', lacking in military prowess and strength (used of women, children, old men: Ovid *Ep.* 1.97; Livy 28.23.2); 2. 'unwarlike', sometimes pejorative = 'timid', sometimes ameliorative = 'peaceful' (Sallust *Jug.* 20.2). Since the Indians and Parthians were generally recognised to be only too keen to make war (*G.* 1.509: *hinc mouet Euphrates ... bellum*, 'Here the Euphrates stirs up war') and not unproficient at it — the standards lost at Carrhae had yet to be regained —, the sense of 'innately unwarlike' cannot be the primary meaning of *imbellis* here. It seems likely in fact that the word is being used in the sense of 'war-worthless' and/or 'unwarlike = timid' either to denote the consequences of Octavian's victories in the east (= 'shown to be war-worthless', 'rendered unwarlike/timid' — so Servius *ad loc.*, and note the juxtaposition, *uictor in oris/imbellem*) or as 'a mere epithet of national contempt for the vanquished' (Conington [37] *ad loc.*). However, in a context redolent with ambivalence the *possibility* of taking *imbellem* as 'innately unwarlike' (perhaps even 'innately peaceful') may not be without its function. What would be generated would be covert, latent, not severe irony.

[104] So Putnam [101] 176f.

claim to sing *Ascraeum carmen* seems not fact or expectation but dim, uncertain, albeit perfervid, hope.

The hope was not long-lived. The *Eclogues*' pessimism about the socio-moral possibilities of the political world and its related scepticism about the power of poetry and art to teach, to affect human behaviour, human values, human history, are reaffirmed in the *Aeneid* in the most developed, total and adamantine form, as the dichotomy between aspiration and actuality, between socio-moral idealism and political practice, are presented as internal, ineradicable features of human existence and associated directly with *furor* — that is to say, associated directly with man's subservience to the passional forces of his psychology, his inability to resist the potentiality for violence and disorder in his own being and his concomitant inability to learn either from experience or from the evaluative ordering of experience in poetry or in art. Scepticism to ambivalence to certainty; meditation to paradox to vision. Ostensibly disparaged in the *Georgics*' final lines, the *Eclogues* perceived the truth.

CHAPTER FOUR

EPIC VISION: THE *AENEID* (1)

No one can claim knowledge of Europe who is ignorant of the following verses:

arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
Italiam fato profugus Lauiniaque uenit
litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.

(*A.* 1.1-7)

Arms I sing and a man, who first from Troy's shores
Fate's exile came to Italy and Lavinian
Coast, hard driven indeed on both land and ocean
By Heaven's violence, for savage Juno's unforgetting wrath,
Hard suffering too in war, till he might found a city
And march gods into Latium; whence the Latin race,
The Alban fathers and the walls of soaring Rome.

As in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, so in the *Aeneid* the opening lines prove program to the work. Climax to the insistent preoccupations of Virgil's earlier poetry, Rome's epic master-work directly confronts — the confrontation is both immediate and sustained — the principal social and moral issue of Rome's world: the nature and value of empire. Through critically ordered, empathetic, verbally stringent narrative the poem investigates the world of political and military power, of *imperium* and *arma*, the socio-moral ideals it accords itself, the 'civilising' order it professes to bestow, and the relationship of that world, those ideals, that order, to the central values of private man. The *Aeneid* images *arma* and *uir*; it studies the latter's strengths, possibilities, ideals, motivations, weaknesses; it examines his relationship to empire and to history, to the past, the present, the future; it analyses his relationship to his own experience and to art. But the *Aeneid* images *arma* and *uir* within the context of *imperium Romanum* (*A.* 1.5-7).

Empire is the *Aeneid*'s cardinal theme. The 'Odyssean' *Aeneid* (Books 1-6)[1] narrates an individual's search for *patria*, *sedes*, *urbs*, *regnum*, 'country', 'home', 'city', 'kingdom', and the subsumption of that search within a larger,

[1] The phrases 'Odyssean *Aeneid*' and 'Iliadic *Aeneid*' are those of Brooks Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964), chapters VI and VII.

historical movement towards Rome, *imperium* and empire; it exhibits the development in the hero's mind of the imperial, Roman ideal. The 'Iliadic' *Aeneid* (Books 7-12) presents the imperial vision in operation, the reality of the imperial process; it narrates the hero's Italian war and examines not only the subsumption of that war within the evolution of Roman destiny but the war's paradigm status; it exhibits the practice of empire.

Empire's ideology, its vision and values, are the thematic corner-stones of the work. Proclaimed at critical points in the epic — in Anchises' revelations to Aeneas at the end of the underworld scene of Book 6 (esp. *A*. 6.756-853), in the description of the great shield made by Vulcan at the end of Book 8 (*A*. 8.626-728), in the reconciliation colloquy of Jupiter and Juno just prior to the final duel of Book 12 (esp. *A*. 12.838-40) — they receive initial and dramatic enunciation at the poem's outset in Book 1 in the great prophecy of Jupiter to the imperial ancestress, mother of Aeneas, Venus:[2]

> nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
> imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
> Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
> hunc tu olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum
> accipies secura; uocabitur hic quoque uotis.
> aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis:
> cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus
> iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis
> claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus
> saeua sedens super arma et centum uinctus aënis
> post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento.
>
> (*A*. 1.286-96)

> There shall be born from this fair stock a Trojan Caesar,
> Whose empire shall stretch to Oceanus, whose fame to the stars,
> A Iulius, his name derived from great Iulus.
> One day, cares ended, you shall receive him in heaven laden
> With the Orient's spoils; he too shall be invoked with prayers.
> Then shall wars cease and the bitter years grow mild:
> White-haired Faith and Vesta, Quirinus in concert with Remus
> His brother shall give justice, the grim, iron-bolted
> Gates of War shall close, and within impious Rage

---

[2] This quartet of 'ideological' passages manifests conspicuous patterning: 1. Jupiter-Venus colloquy following the epic's first 'event'; 2. Speech (revelations) of Aeneas' father to his son at the end of the first half of the central tetrad; 3. Presentation of arms (revelations) by Aeneas' mother to her son at the end of the second half of the central tetrad; 4. Jupiter-Juno colloquy just before the epic's final 'event'. Historical detail abounds in 2 and 3, 1 and 4 concentrating on ideological/moral summary. 1 and 4 are further linked by Jupiter's smile (*olli subridens*, *A*. 1.254, *A*. 12.829) and his concluding reference to the *pietas/furor* issue (*A*. 1.294-96, *A*. 12.838 f.); 2 and 3 by topography (grove, *A*. 6.704, *A*. 8.597, 599; stream, *A*. 6.705, *A*. 8.597, 610; 'secluded valley', *in ualle reducta*, *A*. 6.703, *A*. 8.609) and by Aeneas' 'amazed' reaction (*mirantibus*, *A*. 6.854, *miratur*, *A*. 8.619, 730).

Seated on savage arms, tight-bound with one hundred brazen knots
Behind his back, shall roar hideously from bloody jaws.

Echoes of the *Georgics* underscore meaning. Recalling the earlier work's despairing outcry against Rome's passion for civil war (its appeal to the gods of Rome, its address to Caesar, its terrifying picture of *Mars impius* raging unholily across the world: *G.* 1.498-514), recalling too that poem's architected Caesarian panegyric (its eulogy of 'victorious Romulus' arms', *uictoris arma Quirini*, its laudation of Caesar's divinity, his distribution of justice, his undying fame: *G.* 3.27, *G.* 1.42, *G.* 4.562, *G.* 3.47f.),[3] Jupiter's ideological vision of Rome's future displays the Caesarian world, the contemporary Roman world of empire, *arma* and power,[4] as triumphant moral force. In terms of both its relation to the *Georgics* and its function in the *Aeneid* Jupiter's *Weltanschauung* presents itself as answer not only to Venus' plangent question — *hic pietatis honos*? ('Is this reward for *pietas*?' *A.* 1.253) — but to the suffering, the nullification, of the individual in history.

The ideology of empire may be stated thus: the establishment of empire, in particular of the Roman empire, is the establishment of a socio-moral order through the manifestation and triumph of *pietas* and the subjugation and defeat of *furor* (*A.* 1.291-96);[5] and a corollary of the ideology for the individual is that the establishment of empire confers upon the instruments of empire, the men of destiny and *pietas*, an eternal glory and undying fame (*A.* 1.286ff.).

The ideology's central concepts give us pause. Fundamental to empire's vision, the conflict of *pietas* and *furor* permeates the *Aeneid* and informs its thematic stucture. It is given overt political dimension in fact even before

---

[3] The reference to Caesar's divinity, especially his invocation in prayer, continues the first georgic's association of Caesar with the Daphnis-ideal of the *Eclogues*: *cf. A.* 1.290, *G.* 1.42, *E.* 5.80. See above pp. 41 f.

[4] The historical specificity of the prophecy is noteworthy: 1. *spoliis orientis* (289) presumably refers to Actium and the aftermath; 2. Mention of the 'Gates of War', *Belli portae* (294), which were in the temple of Janus, alludes to their closing (for the first time since 235 B.C.) in 29 B.C. and again in 25 B.C.; 3. The description of *Furor impius* seems to be based on a painting (by Apelles according to Pliny *NH* 35.93) which Augustus placed in his own forum (Servius *ad loc.*).

[5] Note how the triumph of *pietas* embodied in the climactic description of *Furor impius* in chains (*A.* 1.294-96) is embodied too in the focus on Rome's hallowed religious institutions and the reconciliation of Quirinus and Remus (292f.). Jupiter's colloquy with Juno in Book 12 similarly ends on the theme of *furor* suppressed and the rise of Roman *pietas* (*A.* 12.830-840). Not surprisingly. *Pietas* as the moral basis of Rome's power was a cornerstone of the Augustan program: see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (2nd ed. Oxford 1952) 446ff., and *Res Gestae* 34. See also Propertius 3.22.20-22:

famam, Roma, tuae non pudet historiae.
nam quantum ferro tantum pietate potentes
stamus: uictrices temperat ira manus.

Fame, Rome, is not ashamed of your history.
For we stand firm in power as much through *pietas*
As through steel: anger stays victorious hands.

Jupiter's speech in the famous simile of *A.* 1.148ff. The terms themselves are not always understood. A basic motif of both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, *furor* — together with cognates *furo*, *furens*, *furia* — connotes a frenzied derangement of the mind or spirit, something akin to madness; it can be used to refer to hysteria, rage, insanity, bloodlust, passion, love, anger, and the behaviour to which they give rise — wild, mindless, destructive, violent. The poem's initial, pervasive and, as it transpires, most emblematic instance of *furor* — it receives sustained attention in the epic's opening lines (*A.* 1.4, 1.11, 1.25) — is savage Juno's unforgetting anger (*saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram*, *A.* 1.4). *Pietas*, on the other hand, and its cognate *pius* — the latter is absent from Virgil's earlier works (although *impius* occurs: *E.* 1.70; *G.* 1.468, 1.511; *G.* 2.537) — connote (a) a kind of righteousness based upon a sense of duty towards one's family, one's country, one's destiny or one's gods, and (b) — and it is to be noted that this sense of *pietas* has been sorely neglected[6] — pity, compassion. From the point of view of the poem's imperial ideology *pius* Aeneas exemplifies *pietas*, while Dido and Turnus exemplify *furor*. But from the point of view of the way in which Virgil presents the actual behaviour of these major figures a simple correlation of Aeneas with *pietas* and Dido and Turnus with *furor* would be so misleading as to constitute a misunderstanding of the major issues of the poem.[7]

To return to Jupiter's speech and the ideology there proclaimed. It is transparent that the poem's presentation of the relationship of this ideology both to empire's practice and to history as experienced is fundamental to the *Aeneid*'s meaning.[8] Two questions are of signal importance:

---

[6] But not by W. R. Johnson, 'Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*', *CJ* 60 (1965) 360-64, who argues that *pietas* has unambiguous connotations of 'compassion' at several stages in the *Aeneid*. See also W. A. Camps, *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1969) 24: '*pietas* includes pity as well as piety'.

[7] See, e.g., B. Fenik, 'Parallelism of Theme and Imagery in *Aeneid* II and IV', *AJP* 80 (1959) 9, n. 15, who sees as 'one of the major underlying tragic themes of the *Aeneid* — the opposition of reason, discipline, and order, as represented by Aeneas, against the vehement, even heroic, but blind and undisciplined passion characteristic of Dido, Amata, and Turnus'.

[8] It is important to realise at the outset that contrary to what has frequently been asserted (e.g. R. D. Williams, 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*', *Antichthon* 1 [1967] 29-32, and 'The Opening Scenes of the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 5 [1965-66] 19-23) the overtly ideological passages of the *Aeneid* cannot be taken *in themselves* to indicate any admiration on Virgil's part for the achievements of Rome and the Augustan regime. Knowledge of Virgil's or the poem's attitude to *res Romanae* can be obtained only through detailed consideration of the dynamic relationship between the ideological passages and the rest of the poem. Even W. R. Johnson's recent and most sensitive study, *Darkness Visible; A Study of Vergil's Aeneid* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1976), is marred by an unargued assumption of Virgil's admiration for Augustus — 'it is clearly impossible to ignore Vergil's very real (if qualified) admiration for Augustus', p. 15 — and the failure to consider the interaction between the ideological passages of the *Aeneid* and the poem's narrative substance.

(1) Is empire's ideology made reality by empire's practice with resultant justification of the loss and the suffering which the pursuit and the practice of empire involve?

(2) Does the fame which history and empire promise to the individual compensate adequately for the sacrifice and tragedy on which such fame is built?

To both questions the *Aeneid*'s answer is one of firm, incisive denial. Product of profound, determinate pessimism, the final vision allows no vestige of earlier georgic ambivalence.

As the following study shows. The study is in two parts. The present chapter examines the relationship between ideology and practice and between achievement and cost generally in the *Aeneid*, most especially in the final tetrad, and draws attention to Virgil's exacting use of imagery to sustain theme and elicit judgment. The next chapter analyses the sixth *Aeneid* and its thematic ramifications. As that chapter endeavours to present, it is upon the details and observed ramifications of *Aeneid* 6 that much of the specificity and despair of Virgil's epic vision depend.

Ideology and Reality

Dichotomy between the ideology of empire and its practice dominates the 'Iliadic' *Aeneid*. The final tetrad is explicit. Adumbration of the gap between empire's ideology and practice occurs earlier in the poem, noticeably in Book 6[9] and in the ideological passages themselves,[10] but its most pointed appearance is in the battle-books of 9-12, where the disparity between empire's claim to bring a civilising and moral order to the world and the imperial reality of mindless violence and human dissolution is both dramatically evident and pervasive. In Book 9 Aeneas does not appear. The reader will however observe that *furor*, the affirmed ideological opponent of Rome's mission, manifesting itself as a defining feature of Italian aggression, most especially (*A*. 9.59ff., 9.691ff., 9.760f.) of the aggression of Turnus —

sed furor ardentem caedisque insana cupido
egit in aduersos.

(*A*. 9.760f.)

But rage and insane desire for slaughter drove him
Burning into the enemy.

— characterises too (and conspicuously: see *A*. 9.552, 9.652, 9.703, 9.736) the behaviour of the Trojans themselves. The Nisus-Euryalus *excursus* (*A*. 9.176-

[9] Discussed in the next chapter.

[10] See, for example, in relation to the shield p. 173 n. 90 below.

502) is a paradigm-case. Fire imagery, associated with the operation of *furor*,[11] is employed in this episode to suggest the ruinous, impassioned hot-headedness of the Trojan youths — *ardor* ('fire', *A*. 9.184), *ardentem* ('blazing', *A*. 9.198), *incensus* ('inflamed', *A*. 9.342), *feruidus* ('burning', *A*. 9.350); sympathy is evoked for the sleeping victims of their gratuitous, mission-aborting slaughter (*A*. 9.324-66); and language is used of both of them which patently identifies their actions as instances of *furor*. The blood-letting of their butchery stuns:

simul ense superbum
Rhamnetem adgreditur, qui forte tapetibus altis
exstructus toto proflabat pectore somnum,
rex idem et regi Turno gratissimus augur,
sed non augurio potuit depellere pestem.
tris iuxta famulos temere inter tela iacentis
armigerumque Remi premit aurigamque sub ipsis
nactus equis ferroque secat pendentia colla.
tum caput ipsi aufert domino truncumque relinquit
sanguine singultantem; atro tepefacta cruore
terra torique madent. nec non Lamyrumque Lamumque
et iuuenem Serranum, illa qui plurima nocte
luserat, insignis facie, multoque iacebat
membra deo uictus — felix, si protinus illum
aequasset nocti ludum in lucemque tulisset.

(*A*. 9.324-38)

At once with his sword he [Nisus] attacks
Proud Rhammes, who as it happened lay propped up
On a pile of rugs, his whole chest blowing out sleep,
A king himself and King Turnus' favourite augur —
Yet not by augury could he avert destruction.
He overpowers three attendants close by who lay sprawling
Among their spears and Remus' armour-bearer and charioteer,
Caught near the horses; he severs with steel their drooping necks.
Then he removes their master's head too and leaves the trunk
Sobbing with blood; earth and couch are soaked with warm,
Black gore. And then Lamyrus too and Lamus
And young Serranus famous for his beauty,
Who had played long that night and lay with the conquering god
Heavy on his limbs — lucky, if he had continued
His game all night and carried it through to daylight.

Furor unbound, Nisus is lion, madness, bloodlust, rage:

impastus ceu plena leo per ouilia turbans
(suadet enim uesana fames) manditque trahitque
molle pecus mutumque metu, fremit ore cruento.

(*A*. 9.339-41)

---

[11] See below pp. 126 ff.

So an unfed lion rioting through crowded sheep-pens
(For frenzied hunger drives him) mangles and drags
Soft beasts dumb with fear and roars from bloody jaws.

Fremit ore cruento: he roars from bloody jaws. Jupiter's description of *Furor impius* (*fremet ... ore cruento*, *A*. 1.296) seems precisely recalled to relate Trojan actuality in the form of Nisus' slaughter to Jupiter's ideological promise. Nor is Euryalus' *furor* any less (*A*. 9.342). He is inflamed (*incensus*, *A*. 9.342) and raging (*perfurit*, *A*. 9.343); he despatches a vast, nameless multitude of victims (*A*. 9.343ff.); he burns (*feruidus*, *A*. 9.350) with the bloody work, carried away by excessive lust for blood (*nimia caede atque cupidine ferri*, *A*. 9.354). Appropriately his capture elicits from his companion a mindless (*amens*, *A*. 9.424) act of suicide, in which the responsibilities of task and chosen duty are forgotten. Virgil's overt eulogy at *A*. 9.446-49 seems tinged by no small amount of irony:[12]

fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
nulla dies umquam memori uos eximet aeuo,
dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.
(*A*. 9.446-49)

Fortunate pair! If my poetry has power,
No day will ever erase you from time's memory,
While the house of Aeneas dwells by the Capitol's
Immovable rock and Rome's father holds dominion.

Indeed irony pervades the whole of Book 9's famous *excursus*. For it seems less than accidental that, as the opening line of Book 9 indicates, the action of Books 8 and 9 is designed to be largely simultaneous.[13] While Aeneas visits the site of Rome in Arcadian-Saturnian setting, while he receives his mother's embrace and is presented with the divine shield and its primarily ideological image of Rome's future,[14] the burden of which and glory he accepts (*A*. 8.731),

[12] Naive readings of this passage still abound. See, e.g., P. G. Lennox, 'Virgil's Night-Episode Re-examined (*Aeneid* IX.176-449)'. *Hermes* 105 (1977) 331-42, who — with unintentional irony — describes the two youths as 'an example of what might be hoped for from Augustus' own perceptive youth policy' (p. 342). The attempt of G. Williams, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven and London 1983) 205ff., to argue that the pair 'are lucky because, loving one another, they died together' (p. 206) seems similarly naive. Clearly anyway *si quid ... habebit* (*A*. 9.446-49) are — contrary to Williams — intended to express the grounds for the *fortunati* judgment (*cf. E*. 1.46ff., 51 ff., *E*. 5.49, *G*. 2.458ff., *A*. 1.437), the ironic tone of which the context dictates. On the specific nature of the irony here see below p. 121.

[13] On which see M. A. Di Cesare, *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid* (New York and London 1974) 141, 157.

[14] On the ideology-reinforcing nature of the pictures see Williams 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*' [8] 31 f. 'Primarily ideological' is however a necessary qualification. For contra-ideological aspects of the shield see p. 173 below n. 90.

the 'fortunate pair' butcher sleeping Rutulians and vitiate the *imago* in which Aeneas rejoices (*A.* 8.730).

But at least Nisus, Euryalus and the other Trojans have not had direct access to the ideology of their mission, as Aeneas has had in Books 6 and 8. It is in the behaviour of Aeneas, therefore, who has experienced the apocalyptic pronouncements of Anchises in Book 6 and been presented with the shield and its ideology-reinforcing pictures in Book 8, that the ideology-reality antithesis is most telling.

Aeneas' arrival at the battle-scene in Book 10, standing upon the high stern of his ship (*stans celsa in puppi, A.* 10.261) and bearing in his hand the blazing shield (*clipeum ardentem, A.* 10.261-62), is depicted by Virgil with overtones both sinister and prophetic:[15]

> ardet apex capiti cristisque a uertice flamma
> funditur et uastos umbo uomit aureus ignis:
> non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
> sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor
> ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris
> nascitur et laeuo contristat lumine caelum.
>
> (*A.* 10.270-75)

> The helmet-peak blazes on his head, flame pours
> From towering crest and the gold boss disgorges floods of fire:
> As when blood-red comets on a translucent night
> Glow malignant or the blaze of Sirius,
> That bearer of drought and disease to suffering mankind,
> Rises new-born and glooms the sky with sinister light.

Fire images (*ardet*, 270, *flamma*, 270, *ignis*, 271, *ardor*, 273; *cf. ardentem*, 262) are the key-note of the passage; they have the effect of a constatement, that is to say, a critical placing of Aeneas' appearance, upon the destructive implications of which they place firm, decided emphasis. This emphasis is further maintained by the menacing overtones of a whole cluster of words and expressions which the poet chooses to associate with Aeneas at this important moment: *uomit* ('disgorges', 271), *sanguinei* ('blood-red', 273), *lugubre rubent* ('glow malignant' 273), *laeuo contristat lumine* ('glooms with sinister light' 275). The Trojan hero is not portrayed as the redeemer, arising to save his people from madness, violence, rage, but resembles rather the fiery dog-star, which brings drought and disease to suffering humanity (274), and, significantly, resembles it at its birth. For the introduction of the birth image at 275 (*nascitur* 'rises new-born') and the connection of Aeneas with that image suggest — and suggest disconcertingly — that the birth of *Sirius ardor* and the drought,

[15] See J. P. Poe's astute comments, 'Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas', *TAPA* 96 (1965) 330.

pestilence and gloom which that birth generates may provide a more than suitable analogue for the birth of Rome itself. The obvious thematic and verbal parallels between this episode and the shield's description of the appearance of Augustus at Actium (*cf.* esp. *A.* 8.680f. and *A.* 10.270f.; *A.* 8.680 and *A.* 10.261)

> hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
> cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis,
> stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammas
> laeta uomunt patriumque aperitur uertice sidus.
>
> (*A.* 8.678-81)
>
> Here Caesar Augustus leads Italians into battle
> With Fathers and People, with Penates and the Great Gods,
> Standing on the high stern; his exultant brow disgorges
> Twin flames, above his head dawns the ancestral star.

— flatter neither the legendary nor the historical figure. Reinforced by the Aeneas-Augustus analogy in the context of the shield itself (*cf.* *A.* 8.620 and 8.680f.),[16] they serve only to intensify the gulf between ideal and actuality.

The sinister implications of Virgil's account of Aeneas' arrival at the scene of battle — an account conspicuous for its specificity — are confirmed later in Book 10 (510-605), when the news of Pallas' death reaches the Trojan leader. Aeneas' immediate reaction to the news is to lose control of himself completely; belying the ideology propounded in Books 1, 6 and 8, he becomes a rabid, frenzied incarnation of *furor*. He blazes (*ardens*, *A.* 10.514, *ardenti*, *A.* 10.552), rages (*furit*, *A.* 10.545, *furens*, *A.* 10.604), roars (*dira frementem*, *A.* 10.572),[17] and goes beserk (*desaeuit*, *A.* 10.569), like the fire-monster, Aegaeon (*A.* 10.565-68), his sword growing hot with blood (*intepuit mucro*, *A.* 10.570), as he engages in a ruthless, indiscriminate, merciless vendetta,[18] the horror and obscenity of which are made to contrast sharply with the manifest value of the personal relationship which provides the motive for the vendetta.[19] He captures eight Italian youths with the intention of sacrificing (*immolet*, *A.* 10.519) them alive to the ghost of Pallas (*A.* 10.517-20); he rejects Magus' pleas for mercy and slaughters him (*A.* 10.521-36); he slays Haemon's

---

[16] Reinforced too, one might add, by the contemporary association of Aeneas and Augustus (Octavian), his 'descendant', evidenced as early as 42 B.C. on coins minted at Rome (Crawford 4943a = BMCRR Rome 4258).

[17] Perhaps another intentional verbal echo of the description of *Furor impius* at *A.* 1.296.

[18] On this see Johnson [6] 363, C. M. Bowra, 'Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal', *G.&R.* 3 (1933-34) 17ff., and K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description* (London 1968) 18. Otis [1] 357ff. is able to construe Aeneas' vendetta as a manifestation of *humanitas* only by confusing 'humane' with 'human': *cf.* also Otis' article 'Virgil and Clio', *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 62. For a similar view to that of Otis see H. W. Prescott, *The Development of Virgil's Art* (New York 1963) 477: 'Even in the battle scenes the poet presents him as an ideal man as well as a warrior; Aeneas comprehends in himself the cardinal virtues of the Roman citizen in peace and war'.

[19] That it is the personal relationship between Aeneas and Pallas and Evander which provides the motive for the vendetta is clear from *A.* 10.515-17.

son, a priest of Apollo and Trivia (another sacrifice — *immolat*, *A*. 10.541), and the priest's armour is stripped and borne away (*A*. 10.537-42). Aeneas is now in full rage. He lops off Anxur's left arm (*A*. 10.545-49); he rejects the pleas of Tarquitus, the son of the nymph, Dryope, and the woodland god, Faunus, kills him with a blow the effects of which are related in vivid, horrific detail (*A*. 10.554-56), and taunts the mutilated corpse with the threat that it will lie unburied (*A*. 10.557-60) — an act which affords an explicit contrast between Aeneas' behaviour and the respect for the body of Pallas and for Pallas' father, Evander, shown by Turnus less than seventy lines earlier (*A*. 10.491-95). Antaeus, Lucas, Numa and Camers are next (*A*. 10.561-64), then the brothers Lucagus and Liger; Liger's plea for mercy is dismissed contemptuously and bitter taunts accompany both their deaths (*A*. 10.575-601). Significantly, Liger's appeal is to Aeneas' filial *pietas* (*A*. 10.597), and its rejection by the raging hero, like the contempt shown to Magus' similar entreaty earlier in the vendetta (*A*. 10.524 — see esp. Aeneas' taunt at *A*. 10.534), underscores Aeneas' abnegation of his father's moral vision (*A*. 6.853). Designated *pius* by the narrative, Aeneas is all things but.

> talia per campos edebat funera ductor
> Dardanius torrentis aquae uel turbinis atri
> more furens.
>
> (*A*. 10.602-4)
>
> Such deaths the Dardan chief dealt across the field,
> Raging like a torrent or a black hurricane.

The focus now moves away from Aeneas, though only temporarily. But before it does, Aeneas is referred to as *Dardanius* (603) — a description which, in conjunction with the other 'Trojan' epithets or phrases used of him during the vendetta (*Dardanides*, *A*. 10.545, *Troius heros*, *A*. 10.584, *uir Troiane*, *A*. 10.598), seems calculated to suggest a correlation between Aeneas' conduct consequent upon his receipt of the news of Pallas' death and the futile, wanton and frenzied violence perpetrated by the *heroes* at Troy.[20]

The dichotomy between the ideology of empire and its practice, which the behaviour of the Trojan chief in the episode analysed above dramatically points up, is further underscored by Aeneas' conduct at the end of book 10, when he kills both Lausus and Mezentius. Both episodes (*A*. 10.762-832, *A*. 10.833-908) deserve close attention. In the midst of the battle-slaughter Mezentius appears (*A*. 10.762) and Aeneas (*pius*, *A*. 10.783) wounds him (*A*. 10.783-86). Rejoicing (*laetus*, *A*. 10.787) at the sight of his adversary's drawn blood and burning with rage (fire imagery again: *feruidus*, *A*. 10.788),

---

[20] On the exhibited futility of heroic conduct in the *Aeneid* see the excellent chapter, 'The Heroic Impulse', in Quinn [18] 1-22.

Aeneas presses in for the kill. Lausus, Mezentius' son, intervenes (*A*. 10.796ff.), protecting his father with his shield, while his comrades force Aeneas back with a shower of spears and enable Mezentius to withdraw:

Aeneas nubem belli, dum detonet omnis,
sustinet et Lausum increpitat Lausoque minatur:
'quo moriture ruis maioraque uiribus audes?
fallit te incautum pietas tua.' nec minus ille
exsultat demens, saeuae iamque altius irae
Dardanio surgunt ductori, extremaque Lauso
Parcae fila legunt. ualidum namque exigit ensem
per medium Aeneas iuuenem totumque recondit;
transiit et parmam mucro, leuia arma minacis,
et tunicam molli mater quam neuerat auro,
impleuitque sinum sanguis; tum uita per auras
concessit maesta ad Manis corpusque reliquit.
at uero ut uultum uidit morientis et ora,
ora modis Anchisiades pallentia miris,
ingemuit miserans grauiter dextramque tetendit,
et mentem patriae subiit pietatis imago.
'quid tibi nunc, miserande puer, pro laudibus istis,
quid pius Aeneas tanta dabit indole dignum?
arma, quibus laetatus, habe tua; teque parentum
manibus et cineri, si qua est ea cura, remitto.
hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem:
Aeneae magni dextra cadis.' increpat ultro
cunctantis socios et terra subleuat ipsum
sanguine turpantem comptos de more capillos.

(*A*. 10.809-32)

Aeneas endures the cloud of war till all its thunder
Is spent, and rebukes Lausus and threatens Lausus:
'Why rush to your death and dare things beyond your strength?
Your *pietas* deceives you, reckless boy.' But Lausus
Madly persists; and now savage anger soars up
In the Dardan leader, and the Fates gather for Lausus
The final threads; for Aeneas drives his strong sword
Through the youth's midriff and buries it to the hilt.
The sword-point travelled through his buckler, frail armour for defiance,
And the tunic his mother had woven of supple gold,
And its folds streamed with blood. Then melancholy life
Passed through air to the Shades and left the body.
But when he saw the look on the dying face,
A face mysteriously pale, Anchisiades
Groaned deeply in pity, and stretched out his right hand,
And the picture of filial *pietas* gripped his heart:
'What, pitiable lad, shall *pius* Aeneas now give you
For these glorious deeds, something such spirit deserves?
The arms you delighted in — keep; you I restore, if such rites
Mean anything, to the Shades and ashes of your fathers.
Yet this, luckless boy, will console you for your piteous death:

You fall by great Aeneas' hand.' He even rebukes
The hesitant comrades and lifts him from the earth,
His neatly ordered hair becoming foul with blood.

Sympathy for Lausus, already elicted by Virgil in the preceding eulogy (*A.* 10.791-93) and in the emphasis upon the boy's youth (*iuuenis*, *A.* 10.793, 796; continued here: *iuuenem*, 816, *puer*, 825), is sharpened by the detailed precision of the death-blow and its bloody effects (815-19), by the pathetic reference to the mother's delicate toil (818), and by the emotive details of the death itself — Lausus' *maesta uita* ('melancholy life', 819-20) fleeing through the air. But to be noticed also is how Virgil uses this sympathy for Aeneas' victim to focus attention upon the failure of the mission's ideology to realise itself in action. Aeneas' taunt that Lausus is deceived by his *pietas* (*fallit te incautum pietas tua*, 812), surrounded by a portrayal of the Trojan leader (*Dardanio ductori*, 814: another 'Trojan' phrase) overcome by *furor* — he is raging (*furit*, 802), savage anger rises in him (*saeuae irae*, 813) — sounds almost sacrilegious; *pietas* is something of which Aeneas in the fulfilment of his mission has dire need. It is true that pity comes upon Aeneas when he perceives what he has done (821-24), but such pity is worth little if it fails to display itself in action; and Aeneas' words at 825ff. show that he does not see the parallelism between his own action and that of Turnus, and consequently that he fails to comprehend the horror and stupidity of vengeance which issues in deeds more heinous than those for which vengeance is sought.[21] The remark of *pius Aeneas* (826) that Lausus will find solace in glory — the glory of being slain by the hand of the great Trojan leader (*Aeneae magni dextra*, 830) — elevates the *Aeneid*'s major cause of human suffering and dissolution to the status of compensation. Pity conjoined with such naivety and moral blindness chills. It is likely to germinate nothing but confusion, tragedy, waste.

As the slaying of Mezentius demonstrates. In one of the moving interludes that mark the *Aeneid*'s dramatic greatness (*A.* 10.833-71) Virgil translates the reader to the bank of the Tiber, where Mezentius is washing his wounds, his armour lying about him in the peaceful meadow, and presents a scene clearly designed to generate sympathy for Mezentius before his death at the hands of Aeneas. The initial poignant tableau juxtaposing Mezentius' physical and mental distress with nature's eternal quietude (*A.* 10.833ff.), the constant requests for news of Lausus (*A.* 10.839f.), the comrades' tears as they bear

---

[21] See Quinn [18] 341-43. Commentators such as R.D. Williams (ed.), *The Aeneid of Virgil* (2 vols. Basingstoke and London 1972 and 1973) *ad A.* 10.769f., who argue for a crucial difference (favourable to Aeneas) between the Turnus-Pallas and Aeneas-Lausus encounters in Turnus' stripping of Pallas' belt (*A.* 10.495ff.), seem to ignore Pallas' intention to strip Turnus of his armour (referred to twice: *A.* 10.449f., 462f.) and Aeneas' subsequent stripping of Mezentius' armour (*A.* 11.5ff.).

the lifeless corpse (*A.* 10.841f.), the old man's grief, remorse and recognition of misdeeds (*A.* 10.843-56), his display of deep affection for his horse, glory (*decus*) and solace (*solamen*) of his life, and his emotional address to it (A. 10.856-66), the movement into battle in a surge of shame, grief, and madness (*A.* 10.867-71) accentuate the horror of the ensuing scene, its unrelieved sense of wastage, dissolution. Nor does Aeneas' joy (*laetus*, *A.* 10.874) at the prospect of the encounter, mirroring as it does his earlier exultation at the sight of Mezentius' blood (*uiso Tyrrheni sanguine laetus*, *A.* 10.787), alleviate either the horror or the loss. Revealing how little he has learnt from Lausus' piteous death, the Trojan hero's demonic joy points up his accelerating brutalisation, underscores the repulsion of the slaughter to come. Mezentius' courageous opening address (*A.* 10.878-82), Aeneas' premeditated (*multa mouens in animo*, *A.* 10.890) killing of the horse (890-94 — and note that the second love-object is killed, like the first, Lausus, prior to the man himself), the 'heroic' taunt that follows (*A.* 10.897f.), Mezentius' dignified final speech confessing his people's hatred, accepting death, requesting fellowship with his son in the tomb, confirm the reader's developing sympathies. Dichotomy between vision and practice is once again transparent:

'unum hoc per si qua est uictis uenia hostibus oro:
corpus humo patiare tegi. scio acerba meorum
circumstare odia: hunc, oro, defende furorem
et me consortem nati concede sepulcro.'
haec loquitur, iuguloque haud inscius accipit ensem
undantique animam diffundit in arma cruore.

(*A.* 10.903-908)

'This one thing I ask — by any indulgence the defeated
May claim — allow my body its covering of earth. I know
My people's bitter hatred stands round: ward off, I ask, their rage,
And make me my son's companion in the grave.'
So he [Mezentius] speaks; and fully aware receives sword to throat
And in waves of blood pours out life upon armour.

The ideological irony of Mezentius' request for protection from *furor*, the *pietas* of his wish for burial with his son, join with the focus on the Etruscan king's full cognisance of reality (*haud inscius*) and with the emotive impact of the concluding line (the product especially of *undanti*, 'in waves', and *diffundit*, 'pours out', the former echoing imagistically the episode's opening tranquil scene by the river Tiber's 'wave', *undam*, *A.* 10.833) to index the realities — the contra-ideological realities — of the imperial process. *Haud inscius*, as the Lausus incident had shown and the Mezentius episode accents, does not describe the Trojan leader. Ironically it is the 'contemner of the gods' (*contemptor diuum*, *A.* 7.648; *cf.* *A.* 8.7) who sees.

Book 11 provides Aeneas with the opportunity to reflect upon what transpired in Book 10, and indeed the opening lines of the book portray him in

a melancholic, pensive mood; his mind is disturbed by death (*turbataque funere mens est*, *A.* 11.3). It quickly becomes apparent, however, that the death by which he is disturbed is not that which he inflicted upon the Italians and in particular upon Lausus and Mezentius, but rather that suffered by his comrades, especially Pallas, to whom his compassion is entirely restricted (*A.* 11.22-28). The parallelism between the death of Pallas and that of Lausus, which Virgil takes pains to exhibit,[22] is once more demonstrated to be unperceived by Aeneas, whose dedication of the bloody arms of Mezentius as a trophy to the god of war in the opening lines of Book 11 (*maxima res effecta, uiri*, 'great things have been achieved, men', *A.* 11.14) — immediately after his gruesome slaying of Mezentius and all Mezentius had loved (the son, the horse) — shows how little he is able to see of the nature of his own actions, the tragic dissolution which he specifically has wrought. In fact the little blame he attaches to himself for slaughter which he perpetrated in Book 10 is reflected in his cold-blooded fulfilment of the intention formed in the heat of battle (*A.* 10.519-20) to sacrifice eight Italian youths to the shade of Pallas (a course of action which has proved itself a source of embarassment for the traditional interpretations of Virgil's attitude to Aeneas)[23]:

uinxerat et post terga manus, quos mitteret umbris
inferias, caeso sparsurus sanguine flammas.

(*A.* 11.81-82)

He had also bound with hands behind backs those he meant to send
As offerings to the Shades, to sprinkle flames with butchered bood.

These eight innocents sacrificed to salve Aeneas' conscience, that is to say, the guilt he feels over Pallas' death, seem to be referred to in language that recalls two of the ideological passages earlier in the *Aeneid* — the speech of Jupiter in Book 1 (*cf.* the description of *Furor impius* as *uinctus ... post tergum*, 'bound behind his back', *A.* 1.295f.) and the account of the shield in Book 8 (*cf.* the description of the brambles 'sprinkled with the blood' of the perfidious Alban: *sparsi sanguine*, *A.* 8.645). But the purpose of recalling these ideological passages is not to demonstrate the identity of the ideology of empire and its practice but rather to reveal the disparity between the ideological description

---

[22] Both by the proclamation of the affinity of the two youths in qualities and fate at *A.* 10.433 ff. and by the structure and content of the narrative which follows (not to mention such verbal pointers as *miserande puer*, 'pitiable lad', at *A.* 10.825 and *A.* 11.42).

[23] The embarassment is of course exhibited only by those critics who have noticed Aeneas' conduct here, e.g. Camps [6] 29: 'Human sacrifice was barbaric to authors such as Cicero and Livy, and Virgil's presentation of Aeneas here remains extraordinary'. See also W. F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil* (Harmondsworth 1966) 365. There is a report in Suetonius (*Aug.*, 15) that Augustus sacrificed 300 prisoners of the Perusine war on the Ides of March at the altar of Julius Caesar — an action which, it might be argued, bears much thinking upon by those who wish to see in the characterisation of Aeneas the poet's sincere admiration for Augustus and his achievements.

of the imperial process and its experienced actuality. The self-evident (that is to say, contextually self-evident) turpitude of Aeneas' action, the unjustifiability of the slaughter of these Italian youths, makes it clear that they are not so much a manifestation of *furor*, as the ideology would lead one to believe, as victims of it, and victims of it at work as an instrument of empire itself. The compassion, the *pietas*, exhibited in Aeneas' speech over the dead body of Pallas (*A*. 11.42-58)[24] is significantly absent from the Trojan leader's treatment of his young Italian captives.[25] When the Italian envoys arrive requesting a truce and Aeneas declares nobly that he would be glad to grant peace to the living as well as to the dead (*equidem et uiuis concedere uellem*, *A*. 11.111), it is important for the reader not to forget that thirty lines before Aeneas had sent eight such living Italians to an unjustified and unjustifiable death.[26] Indeed the self-deception intimated to be present in Aeneas' verbally magnanimous gesture by the immediately preceding context seems confirmed later in Book 11 (*A*. 11.445-46) when Aeneas displays the same dichotomy between word and act by initiating the recommencement of hostilities (transparently in breach of the twelve-day truce agreed to at *A*. 11.133 — hence the Latins are surprised [*A*. 11.447ff.], there seem to be nine days still to go [*tertia lux*, *A*. 11.210]),[27] thereby thwarting the peace-efforts of Latinus and Drances. Of Aeneas' much praised speech to the Italian envoys it seems therefore fair to ask: what price nobility that fails to issue in action?

Book 12, the final book of the *Aeneid* (and, because final, most crucial in respect of the issue under examination), presents clearly and decisively the collapse of the imperial ideology.[28] It offers to the reader a tightly organised dramatic narrative — empathetic, emotive, and permeated with implicit judgement — which draws the reader into the experience related and, as it were, forces him, as *de facto* witness, to respond to, as well as to observe, the inevitable discrepancy between the ideals and the realities of empire.

To begin with — Aeneas. Following immediately upon the book's opening

---

[24] Discussed below pp. 122f. and n. 75.

[25] And *clementia*, it is to be remembered, is an acclaimed cardinal Augustan virtue. The golden shield presented to Augustus in 28/27 B.C. by the Senate and People of Rome commemorated his *uirtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas* (*Res Gestae* 34).

[26] The anomalies of Aeneas' behaviour were noted by Lactantius, *Inst*. 5.10.5, who contrasts Aeneas' conduct after the death of Pallas (particularly his capture of prisoners for sacrifice and his behaviour at the end of Book 12) with his promises of peace to the Italian envoys at *A*. 11.111f.

[27] A. Cartault, *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide* (Paris 1926) 819, thinks that the twelve-day truce (*A*. 11.133) is a piece of unrevised Homeric imitation ('une passage d'imitation homérique directe') and that the disparity between it and *tertia lux* (*A*. 11.210) would have been ironed out in a final draft. Such an explanation — critically a last resort — is rendered the more implausible in this case by the fact that the constituents of this alleged disparity are separated by less than eighty lines.

[28] *Cf*. M.C.J. Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass. 1966) Chapter 4 'Tragic Victory', although Putnam's claim that Book 12 represents 'at least a partial revaluation of his [Virgil's] epic's purpose and achievement' (p. 152) seems to me ill-founded.

picture of the frenzied, blazing Turnus (esp. *A*. 12.101-06), the Trojan leader's initial appearance in Book 12 does little to dissipate the suggestions of the preceding books. 'Savage in arms' (*saeuum ... in armis*, *A*. 11.910) in the concluding lines of Book 11, Aeneas is this and more. As he receives the offer of a truce and a deciding duel with Turnus, *saeuitia* mingles with anger, with joy:

nec minus interea maternis saeuus in armis
Aeneas acuit Martem et se suscitat ira,
oblato gaudens componi foedere bellum.
tum socios maestique metum solatur Iuli
fata docens.

(*A*. 12.107-111)

Meanwhile no less savage in arms his mother gave
Aeneas sharpens his war spirit, stirs himself with anger,
Rejoicing that the treaty offered settled the war.
Then he consoles his comrades and sad Iulus' fear
Teaching them of fate.

Again the disturbing amalgam of *pietas* (compassion, obligation to others) and *furor* — *furor* specifically and suggestively in the form of savagery (*saeuitia*) and anger (*ira*). Savagery and anger — Juno's defining attributes in the *Aeneid*'s opening lines (*saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram*, 'for savage Juno's unforgetting wrath', *A*. 1.4) — were keynotes of Aeneas' furious behaviour in Book 10 (e.g. *desaeuit*, *A*. 10.519, *saeuae irae*, *A*. 10.813), with which the present passage obviously connects. Similarly Aeneas' behaviour in Book 10 seems expressly recalled in his second appearance in the book when, as he and his son leave the encampment to proceed to the altars erected for the truce-making ceremony, the Trojan leader is described fatefully as *sidereo flagrans clipeo* ('blazing with starry shield', *A*. 12.167). Returning the reader to the presentation of Aeneas' arrival at the scene of battle in Book 10 — fire-disgorging shield in hand, himself like the pestilential blaze of the dog-star, *Sirius ardor* (*A*. 10.270ff.) — fire and star images combine to prefigure Aeneas' destructive *furor* to come. Not that *furor* erupts immediately. Aeneas' speech at the truce-making ceremony appears to have all the hallmarks of *pietas* (*pius Aeneas*, *A*. 12.175), as does the famous appeal for restraint that follows the breaking of the truce:

at pius Aeneas dextram tendebat inermem
nudato capite atque suos clamore uocabat:
'quo ruitis? quaeue ista repens discordia surgit?
o cohibete iras!'

(*A*. 12.311-14)

But *pius* Aeneas stretched out his weaponless hand,
His head bared, and shouted loudly to his men:
'Where are you rushing? Why this sudden eruption of strife?
O restrain your anger.'

Overt echo of Horace's seventh epode (*Ep.* 7.1) secures the connection with Virgil's contemporary world. Aeneas, wounded, withdraws from the field (*A.* 12.324), apparently a paradigm of *pietas* and one with contemporary import.

Inevitably the paradigm proves short-lived. For all Aeneas' verbal *pietas* in the truce-scene, on his return to the fighting he yields irresistibly to *furor.* Indeed the move into *furor* is specifically marked by Virgil, when in the course of his increasingly frustrated search for Turnus Aeneas finds himself attacked by Messapus (*A.* 12.488ff.). Sudden anger rises in the Trojan leader, as it had in the confrontation with Lausus (*irae ... surgunt, A.* 10.814f.):

> tum uero adsurgunt irae, insidiisque subactus,
> diuersos ubi sensit equos currumque referri,
> multa Iouem et laesi testatus foederis aras
> iam tandem inuadit medios et Marte secundo
> terribilis saeuam nullo discrimine caedem
> suscitat, irarumque omnis effundit habenas.
>
> (*A.* 12.494-99)

> Then indeed his anger soars; and driven by the ambush,
> When he saw the horses and chariot taken far away,
> Calling long on Jove and the altars of the broken pact,
> At last he charges into the fray and, with Mars behind him,
> Terrifying he wreaks savage, indiscriminate
> Carnage and releases all his anger's reins.

Initially restrained as he searched the battle lines for Turnus, Aeneas' fighting now becomes as bloody and as indiscriminate as in the furious vendetta of Book 10. His slaughter immediately and explicitly presented as indistinguishable from that of Turnus (*A.* 12.500-50), Aeneas from this point through to the end of Book 12 is portrayed as a ruthless embodiment of *furor.* As not only narrative attests. Images of fire, storm, serpent, wounding and hunting are associated with Aeneas' actions (esp. *A.* 12.521ff., 528, 531, 557, 560, 573, 588, 700ff., 720, 748, 749ff., 848, 921ff., 946, 948, 949, 951 — *cf.* earlier *A.* 12.5, 167, 451ff., 467, 482) in a way which not only aligns the fate of Turnus in Book 12 with the fate of Dido in Book 4 and of the Trojans in Book 2,[29] but which also indexes the Trojan hero's behaviour as progeny of *furor.* The notion of Aeneas

---

[29] Hunting imagery is particularly appropriate for recalling the fate of Dido: see, e.g., the hunt (*A.* 4.129ff.) which proves Dido's ruin and the picture of Aeneas, the hunter, who unwarily (*nescius*) wounds Dido (*A.* 4.69ff.). There is no 'unwariness' involved in the simile at *A.* 12.749ff., where the word *nescius* is conspicuously absent. The wound image is also important in this connection: like Dido, Turnus is wounded by Aeneas (*cf. A.* 12.4ff. and *A.* 4.1 f., 69ff.). On the deer image and its role in reinforcing the parallelism of the fates of Dido and Turnus see p. 125f. Other images common to both their fates include : storm and fire (see pp. 126ff.); bird of ill omen (*A.* 4.462f., *A.* 12.862-64); nightmare (*A.* 4.465-68, *A.* 12.908-12). Note also the bee similes at *A.* 1.430-36 and *A.* 12.587-92. On the alignment of Turnus' fate with that of the Trojans in Book 2 observe the poet's specific and pervasive association in the second *Aeneid* of images of fire, storm, serpent, wound with the sack of the city. See below pp. 126-29.

as destructive, extirpative force is particularly accented by the similes of *A.* 12.587ff. and *A.* 12.749ff. — the former especially telling because of the irony of the *pastor* image (and this time Aeneas is no accidental destroyer: contrast *pastor nescius* at *A.* 4. 71f.) and because of the association of the *Georgics'* concluding symbol of political regeneration and harmony, the bee community, with the city Aeneas fires (echoes here of Dido's Carthage: *cf. A.* 1.430ff., itself modelled on *G.* 4.162-69). Accented too by the analogy with Pyrrhus. When Aeneas attacks Latinus' city at *A.* 12.554ff., Virgil takes pains through thematic and (to a lesser extent) verbal parallelism (but note the verbal repetition at *A.* 2.494 and *A.* 12.577 of *primosque trucidant*, 'they butcher the first in line', and at *A.* 2.479 and *A.* 12.579 of *ipse inter primos*, 'himself among the leaders') to recall Pyrrhus' assault upon Priam's palace in Book 2 (*A.* 2.469ff.).[30] Since Pyrrhus in Book 2 is an obvious *exemplum* of *furor* (he is virtually *furor* incarnate),[31] the implication that Aeneas is playing the role of a second Pyrrhus, another Achilles reborn,[32] is editorial comment by Virgil upon the violence and destructiveness of the Trojan hero's actions in Book 12. The appeal to Jupiter and to altars that accompanies the onset of his battle-rage (*A.* 12.496), like the ensuing hortatory claim to have Jupiter on his side (*Iuppiter hac stat*, *A.* 12.565), may anaesthetise the Trojan Pyrrhus' conscience, but it provides little comfort to the victims of his *furor*.

The notion of Aeneas as Trojan Pyrrhus, another Achilles reborn, is not limited to the attack upon Latinus' city. Suggested many times in the *Aeneid*,[33] it is sustained throughout Book 12 by the Aeneas-Achilles and Turnus-Hector analogies which permeate the book and receive special emphasis during the final duel (*cf. A.* 12.725-27, 749-55, 760-62, 764f., 786f., 899f., 908-12, 952 and *Iliad* 22.208-13, 188-93, 205-07, 159-61, 276f., 12.445-50, 22.199-201, 362f. — respectively). There is also the important analogy between Turnus and Priam,

---

[30] Thematic and verbal parallelism also generates an important analogy between Dido and Amata. Compare: (a) Amata's words at *A.* 12.56-60 with those of Dido at *A.* 4.314-19 (note also the expression *at regina*, 'but the queen', *A.* 12.54, which recalls the use of the same phrase of Dido at the opening of each of the three main sections of Book 4, *A.* 4.1, 296, 504, and the epithet *moritura*, 'about to die', *A.* 12.55, used of Dido at *A.* 4.308, 415, 519, 604); (b) Amata's suicide at *A.* 12.593ff. with that of Dido at the end of Book 4 (note the recurrence of the emotive 'Dido' adjectives, *moritura*, *A.* 12.602, and *infelix*, 'luckless', 'ill-starred', *A.* 12.598: *cf. A.* 1.712, 749; *A.* 4.68, 450, 529, 596; *A.* 6.456), the effect of which on their respective cities is identical: *concussit urbem* ('stunned the city', *A.* 12.594); *concussam urbem* ('the stunned city', *A.* 4.666). On thematic and verbal parallelism generally in Book 12 see Putnam [28] Chapter 4.

[31] See B.M.W. Knox's important essay, 'The Serpent and the Flame: the Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 71 (1950) 379-400, esp. 393: reprinted in S. Commager (ed.), *Virgil* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1966) 124-42, esp. 136.

[32] Knox [31] 394f.

[33] See below pp. 154ff. Useful comments on the Aeneas-Achilles analogue can be found in W.S. Anderson, 'Vergil's Second Iliad', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 17-30, and L.A. Mackay, 'Achilles as Model for Aeneas', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 11-16.

which comes to the fore in the concluding lines of *Aeneid* 12, as Turnus pleads for the return of himself or his dead body to his father, Daunus:

ille humilis supplex oculos dextramque precantem
protendens 'equidem merui nec deprecor' inquit;
'utere sorte tua. miseri te si qua parentis
tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis
Anchises genitor) Dauni miserere senectae
et me, seu corpus spoliatum lumine mauis,
redde meis. uicisti et uictum tendere palmas
Ausonii uidere; tua est Lauinia coniunx,
ulterius ne tende odiis.'

(*A*. 12.930-38)

Humbled and suppliant, he lifts eyes and outstretched hand in prayer:
'I have indeed earned this and make no plea against it.
Use your chance. But if an unhappy father's distress
Can touch you, I ask — for you too had such a father
In Anchises — have pity on Daunus' years
And give me back — or, if you wish, my body robbed of life —
To my kin. You've won; the Ausonians have seen me, beaten,
Stretch out my hands. Lavinia is yours to wed.
Do not take hatred further.'

Turnus' remark to Aeneas, *fuit et tibi talis/Anchises genitor* ('you too had such a father/In Anchises', *A*. 12.933f.) translates Priam's comment on Achilles at *Iliad* 22.420f., καὶ δέ νυ τῷ γε πατὴρ τοιόσδε τέτυκται, / Πηλεύς ('He too had such a father in Peleus'); while Virgil's description of the Italian champion in his last moments — humbled (*humilis*, 930), a suppliant (*supplex*, 930), lifting his eyes and outstretched hand in prayer (930f.) — seems clearly intended to recall Priam, and in particular the picture of Priam at *A*. 1.487, stretching forth his weaponless hands (*tendentemque manus inermis*) in supplication to Achilles. Indeed the Turnus-Hector-Priam equation with which Book 12 closes makes it clear that the Achilles pictured on Dido's temple in Book 1 (*A*. 1.450ff.) — the slayer of Hector to whom Priam makes his plea (*A*. 1.483-87) — is, though Aeneas recognises it not,[34] an image of Aeneas to come. *Saeuus Achilles* (*A*. 1.458) proves moral ancestor of *saeuus Aeneas* (*A*. 12.107f.).

Nor does Virgil's handling of the gods in Book 12 do anything to counteract the implications of Aeneas' conduct. The action of Venus,[35] legendary

[34] This failure of the pictures *ultimately* to affect Aeneas' behaviour, so that he reproduces in his own conduct the atrocities of the Trojan war and generates the sort of human tragedy and loss which the pictures themselves deprecate, is one of the most important connotations of the enigmatic phrase, *animum pictura pascit inani* ('he feeds his soul on the futile picture', *A*. 1.464.). See below p. 113.

[35] Putnam [28] 174 rightly regards Venus' role in Book 12 as destructive, but seems to me mistaken in seeing her role as having changed as the poem progresses. Throughout the whole of the *Aeneid* Venus' behaviour is capricious, unscrupulous and utterly consistent, manifesting at all

ancestress of the Roman imperial family, in instigating the attack upon Latinus' city (*A*. 12.554ff.) is hardly flattering to the Roman cause. The city is defenceless, filled with women, old men and an unarmed throng (*A*. 12.131-33), and even Aeneas' own words seem to reveal covert awareness of the turpitude of the deed (*A*. 12.565f. and 573). The irony of the episode's opening description of Venus as *Aeneae genetrix pulcherrima* ('Aeneas' mother most fair', *A*. 12.554) is blatant and acerbic. Disapprobation towards Venus' conduct is also evident in the episode (*A*. 12.766-90) in which she wrests Aeneas' spear from the root of a tree sacred to Faunus, the native Italian god of the countryside. Turnus' appeal to the Italian god is treated sympathetically by Virgil —

> 'Faune, precor, miserere' inquit 'tuque optima ferrum
> Terra tene, colui uestros si semper honores,
> quos contra Aeneadae bello fecere profanos.'
>
> (*A*. 12.777-79)
>
> 'Faunus', he cries, 'I beg you, have pity, and you, good Earth,
> Hold fast the steel, if always I have upheld your worship,
> Which the Aeneadae have profaned with war.'

— in a manner which contrasts with the narrative's censorious comment upon the action of the Trojans in removing the trunk of the sacred tree:

> forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris
> hic steterat, nautis olim uenerabile lignum,
> seruati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant
> Laurenti diuo et uotas suspendere uestis;
> sed stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum
> sustulerant, puro ut possent concurrere campo.
>
> (*A*. 12.766-71)
>
> By chance a bitter-leafed wild olive-tree sacred to Faunus
> Had stood here — a tree once venerated by sailors
> Who, saved from the waves, fastened offerings on it
> To the Laurentine god and hung clothes which they had vowed.
> But the Trojans indiscriminately had removed
> The sacred trunk so they could fight on clear ground.

The Trojan action is sacrilegious and indiscriminate (*nullo discrimine*, 770) and recalls the indiscriminate slaughter (*nullo discrimine*, *A*. 12.498) perpetrated by

---

times a perverse blindness to considerations other than those which affect Aeneas' personal safety and advancement. Callous disregard of the welfare of Dido displayed in the Cupid incident of Book 1 (*A*. 1.657 ff.) and in the liaison with Juno in Book 4 (*A*. 4.90 ff.) is succeeded in Book 5 by callous disregard of the welfare even of Aeneas' faithful helmsman, Palinurus. Told that Aeneas' safety on the voyage from Sicily to Italy will be assured and assured by the loss of another's life — *unum pro multis dabitur caput*, 'one life shall be given for many', *A*. 5.815 (it is Palinurus' life) — Venus' reaction is one of untrammelled pleasure: *laeta deae permulsit pectora* (*A*. 5.816). For a contrasting view, at least of Venus' conduct at *A*. 12.554 ff., see Williams [12] 24, who sees it as a trope for a 'bright idea'.

Aeneas earlier in Book 12. Faunus' attempt to keep Aeneas' weapon away from his grasp is a compassionate response to an Italian who, unlike the Trojans, recognises the sanctity of the tree (778); but it is a response which proves useless in the face of the superior power of the imperial protectress, Venus, who 'rips' (*reuellit*, *A*. 12.787 — a violent word) the spear from the stump. The symbolism of the episode is plain: the indigenous sanctity and values of a free, pastoral Italy are being pushed aside by the violence and exigencies of the imperial process.[36]

But whereas Aeneas' Olympian auxiliary appears in an unflattering light, Turnus' divine ally, Juturna, is treated favourably.[37] It is true that she engineers the breaking of the truce (*A*. 12.222ff.), but her motives are sympathetic ones, especially in view of the inequality of the match between Aeneas and Turnus (*A*. 12.149, 216, 218, 243). Unlike the other immortals Juturna is close enough to mortality to display important human values. Her love for her brother dictates all. It is this which motivates her every action — she is like a sparrow seeking to preserve the lives of its nestlings (*A*. 12.473ff.); and it is this which, when Turnus' fate is sealed by the appearance of one of the *Dirae*, raises her in the midst of personal anguish and despair to the status of a profoundly tragic figure (*A*. 12.869-86). Her tragedy moreover is more than human; ironically it is exacerbated by her own divinity. Deprived of the brother without whom life holds no sweetness for her, she is yet prevented from joining him by the immortality bestowed upon her by Jupiter. What had been intended as a reward for the rape of her virginity (*A*. ·12.141, 878)[38] becomes to her but a curse:

o quae satis ima dehiscat
terra mihi, Manisque deam demittat ad imos?

(*A*. 12.883-84)

O what earth may gape deep enough
For me and cast a goddess down to the lowest Shades?

The answer is none. Her tragedy is the more severe because she cannot end it by death.

The sympathy aroused for Juturna — heightened by parallelism between her fate and that of Dido's sister, Anna (both regard life as meaningless without their respective loved ones, both lament bitterly not joining them in death [*cf*. *A*. 12.872-84 and *A*. 4.675-85], 'tearing face with nails and bruising breast with

---

[36] *Cf*. Putnam [28] 189f.

[37] A sensitive analysis of Juturna's role in Book 12 can be found in Di Cesare [13] 213-18.

[38] Jupiter's rape of Juturna's virginity, emphasised at *A*. 12.141 and 878, seems to function as a symbol of Aeneas' conquest of virgin Italy, which is suggested elsewhere to be akin to virgin-rape. See further n. 76 and p. 167 below. For the association of the virgin-rape analogue with Aeneas' plucking of the golden bough see C.P. Segal, 'The Hesitation of the Golden Bough: A Re-examination', *Hermes* 86 (1968-69) 79.

fists', *unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis*, *A*. 12.871 = *A*. 4.673)[39] — functions in a similar way to the implicit censure of Venus' conduct in Book 12; it alienates the reader from Aeneas. The same effect is also achieved by the appearance of one of the *Dirae* to mark the downfall of Turnus (*A*. 12.845ff.); for the role of this serpentine daughter of night (*sata Nocte*, *A*. 12.860 — used of Allecto at *A*. 7.331)[40] and obvious embodiment of *furor* as instrument of Jupiter and collaborator of Aeneas ill accords with the ascription of the *pietas* ideal to the development of Rome and her empire.[41] Indeed the fact that Jupiter's sending of one of the *Dirae* (*A*. 12.843ff.) immediately follows Juno's reconciliation with him (*A*. 12.791-842) suggests that the famous reconciliation scene itself is intended to represent not so much the defeat of Juno and *furor* as their victory.[42] Ideally the ending of Juno's opposition ought to betoken Rome's ideological victory over *furor* (see esp. *A*. 12.832); but the *Dira* episode, starkly juxtaposed as it is with the reconciliation scene, immediately precludes this interpretation and demonstrates with imagistic clarity what is confirmed elsewhere in Book 12 by the actions of Aeneas himself — that it is the forces of violence and non-reason which are triumphant and it is to these and the Saturnian goddess (*Saturnia*, *A*. 12.807 and *passim*) that the victory belongs. Pastoral and georgic idealism (*Saturnia regna*, *E*. 4.6, *E*. 6.41; *Saturnia tellus*, *G*. 2.173) shatters.

But this, it might be argued, distorts. The opening lines of Book 12 (*A*. 12.1-106), for example, portray Turnus' opposition to Aeneas as an unequivocal instance of *furor*.[43] Almost every thematic term pertinent to *furor* is used of the Rutulian hero in this passage: *ardet* ('he blazes', *A*. 12.3, 71), *ardentem* ('blazing', *A*. 12.55), *ardentis* ('blazing', *A*. 12.101), *saucius* ('wounded', *A*.

[39] See Putnam [28] 199.

[40] Thus the Furies encompass the action of Books 7-12.

[41] The periphrastic description of the three *Dirae* (*A*. 12.845-47) enables Virgil to use in connection with these fiends the epithet *geminae* ('twin', *A*. 12.845), which, together with the reference to *serpentum spiris* ('serpent coils', *A*. 12.848), serves to recall the prime symbols of *furor* in Book 2, the *gemini angues* or *dracones* ('twin serpents', *A*. 2.203f. and 225 — see below pp. 127ff.). Indeed because of the occurrence of the adjective *geminus* in connection with the serpents at *A*. 2.203, 225, *A*. 7.450, *A*. 8.289, 697, with the Atridae at *A*. 2.415, 500, *A*. 8.130, and with the *Dirae* at *A*. 12.845, it might not be too fanciful to ascribe sinister overtones to the adjective in some of the other contexts in which it occurs (e.g. at *A*. 1.274, *A*. 6.779, *A*. 8.631 in connection with Romulus and Remus; at *A*. 7.280, *A*. 11.72 in connection with Aeneas; at *A*. 8.680 in connection with Augustus; at *A*. 6.893, *A*. 7.607 in connection with the gates of sleep and war respectively; at *A*. 6.190, 203 in connection with the golden bough). See also Poe [15] 335f. Note also that the use of the expression *mortalibus aegris* (' suffering mankind', *A*. 12.850) connects the *Dirae* with Aeneas in Book 10 (*cf*. *A*. 10.274) and the *furor* which erupts at Troy in Book 2 (*cf*. *A*. 2.268).

[42] See also Putnam [28] 201, Johnson [8] 122ff., and L.A. Mackay, 'Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*', *TAPA* 94 (1963) 162.

[43] See, e.g., W.S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1969) 92f.

12.5), *accenso* ('inflamed', *A.* 12.9), *uiolentia* ('violence', *A.* 12.9,45), *turbidus* ('wild', *A.* 12.10), *turbat* ('drives wild', *A.* 12.70), *furiis* ('rage', *A.* 12.101), *scintillae* ('sparks', *A.* 12.102), *ignis* ('fire', *A.* 12.102).[44] And to these are to be added the bull simile (*A.* 12.103ff.), which stresses the wild, irrational, animalistic nature of Turnus, and the lion simile (*A.* 12.4ff.), which, in addition to the same function, specifically accents Turnus' role as an incarnation of *furor* (the phrase, *fremit ore cruento*, 'roars from bloody jaws', *A.* 12.8, seems intended to recall not only the raging lion to which the blood-thirsty Nisus is compared in the slaughter of Book 9 [*fremit ore cruento*, *A.* 9.341] but also Jupiter's description of *Furor impius* in Book 1 [*fremet horridus ore cruento*, *A.* 1.296]). Aeneas, on the other hand, it might well be claimed,[45] exhibits in his conduct at *A.* 12.175ff. and especially at *A.* 12.311ff. the highest Augustan ideals. Such at least would be an understandable response to the opening of the latter passage. Understandable but inadequate. The question most relevant to the issue of the dichotomy between the ideology of empire and its practice is not whether Aeneas acts nobly at *A.* 12.175ff. and 311ff. (the answer to which is not as simple as it might appear), but whether any ideals which might be said to be manifested in his conduct in these passages can be said to be displayed in his actions in the second half of the Book. The answer to this is that they are not so displayed.

The Turnus problem is more complicated. It is true that Virgil takes great pains in *A.* 12.1-106 to portray Turnus as *exemplum* of *furor*. But Virgil also takes pains to portray him as victim:

> Turnus ut infractos aduerso Marte Latinos
> defecisse uidet, sua nunc promissa reposci,
> se signari oculis, ultro implacabilis ardet
> attollitque animos. Poenorum qualis in aruis
> saucius ille graui uenantum uulnere pectus
> tum demum mouet arma leo, gaudetque comantis
> excutiens ceruice toros fixumque latronis
> impauidus frangit telum et fremit ore cruento:
> haud secus accenso gliscit uiolentia Turno.
>
> (*A.* 12.1-9)

> Turnus, when he sees the Latins broken by the countercourse
> Of Mars and strengthless, his promises now demanded,
> Himself the target of men's eyes, burns implacably
> And makes his spirit soar. As a lion in Punic fields
> Wounded gravely in the chest by the hunters' blow
> At last moves into battle and rejoices

[44] From the point of view of the contemporary resonances of this avalanche of *furor* terms it is worth noting the application of many of them (esp. *uiolentia*, *furor*, *ardor*) to Antony in Cicero's *Philippics* (e.g. *Phil.* 2.68, 5.19, 5.23, 5.37, 5.43, 12.26, 13.18).

[45] See, e.g., Otis [1] 374 n. 1., and Anderson [43] 93f.

To toss rippling mane on neck, fearless he snaps
The brigand's implanted spear and roars from bloody jaws:
Just so in blazing Turnus violence swells.

The recall of the Nisus lion-simile of Book 9 (*A*. 9.339-41) points to differences as well as to similarities. Unlike the *furor* of Nisus, likened to an 'unfed lion's' rage (*impastus leo*, *A*. 9.339), that of Turnus is a response to violence upon himself, product of a wound inflicted by hunters (*uenantum*, 5), by a brigand (*latronis*, 7).[46] Like Dido, to whom the poet clearly alludes through images of wound and hunt (*cf.* esp. *A*. 4.1-5, 66-73) and the use of *Poenorum* ('Punic', 4), Turnus is presented as victim of Aeneas. And of himself. The use of *uiolentia* at *A*. 12.9 and *A*. 12.45 as grammatical subject images Turnus as victim of his own furious, violent rage; and that violence's paradoxical exacerbation by Latinus' potentially healing words (*exsuperat magis aegrescitque medendo*, 'it rises higher and worsens with healing', *A*. 12.46) — together with the continuing emphasis upon Turnus' youth (*iuuenis*, *A*. 12.19, *iuuenem*, *A*. 12.149, 598, *iuuenali*, *A*. 12.221) and upon the inequality of the contest with Aeneas (*imparibus fatis*, 'unequal fate', *A*. 12.149, *impar pugna*, 'unequal fight', *A*. 12.216, *non uiribus aequis*, 'not of equal strength', *A*. 12.218, *sortem iniquam*, 'unfair lot', *A*. 12.243) — underlines Turnus' essential vulnerability, his status as victim, and elicits the reader's sympathy for him. As does the emotive picture of Turnus' suppliant procession to the altar:

adiuuat incessu tacito progressus et aram
suppliciter uenerans demisso lumine Turnus
tabentesque genae et iuuenali in corpore pallor.

(*A*. 12.219-21)

Turnus fans anxiety as he advances with silent steps
And, suppliant, worships at the altar with downcast eyes,
His cheeks wasted,[47] pallor in his young body.

Similarly the reader is drawn sympathetically towards Turnus by his development through the animal similes in which he is involved from wounded lion (*A*. 12.4ff.) to bull deprived of its kingdom and spurred on by love (*A*. 12.103ff.),[48] to bull fighting over pasture, herd and heifers (*A*. 12.715ff.), to hunted stag (*A*. 12.749ff.) — the more so because it is counterpointed by

---

[46] This is the only occasion in Virgil's works where *latro* occurs. Elsewhere the word means 'robber, brigand, bandit, plunderer' etc. It would be not a little odd if on this occasion only it meant simply 'huntsman' (so Williams [21] *ad loc.*).

[47] Or, if the less satisfactory *pubentes* is read at *A*. 12.221, 'His cheeks youthful'.

[48] That this is the primary meaning of the bull simile at *A*. 12. 103ff. in relation to Turnus' psychological state seems clear from the context of the *Georgic* 3 passage (*G*. 3.224-34), from which the simile is derived (even to the extent of the importation of two and a half lines: *cf*. *A*. 12.104-06 and *G*. 3.232-34) and to which it patently alludes. R. A. Hornsby, *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid* (Iowa City 1970) 121 f. strangely ignores the *Georgics*' reference.

the reverse development of Aeneas in the same similes from huntsman and brigand (*A.* 12.4ff.) to bull (*A.* 12.103ff., 715ff.), to hunter dog (*uenator canis*, *A.* 12.751). Such sympathy (nor should it be forgotten that Turnus, unlike Aeneas, is actually said to love Lavinia : *A.* 12.70, 668) challenges not only the historical forces which Aeneas represents but the imperial ideology itself. Turnus is an incarnation of *Furor impius*, but it does not follow, as the ideology dictates, that the world is a better place for his removal from it. For many of the qualities which Turnus possesses — courage, integrity, self-pride, compassion, love, reverence and (eventually) understanding — manifest precisely those values upon the preservation of which the quality and richness of human life depend.

About this Virgil is emphatic. Likened to the thunder of bloody Mars (*A.* 12.331ff.) and the storm-blasts of Boreas (*A.* 12.365ff.), Turnus' fighting after the breaking of the truce is bloodthirsty, violent, merciless (*A.* 12.324-82, 500-53, esp. 500-12), as was much of his fighting before the truce, especially in Book 9. But when Saces rides out from the city and asks Turnus to have pity on his people (*miserere tuorum*, *A.* 12.653), the Rutulian hero stands revealed as a man of honour, self-pride, compassion, love, courage — and suddenly of self-awareness, of tragic perception:

obstipuit uaria confusus imagine rerum
Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; aestuat ingens
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu
et furiis agitatus amor et conscia uirtus.
ut primum discussae umbrae et lux reddita menti;
ardentis oculorum orbis ad moenia torsit
turbidus eque rotis magnam respexit ad urbem.
ecce autem flammis inter tabulata uolutus
ad caelum undabat uertex turrimque tenebat,
turrim compactis trabibus quam eduxerat ipse
subdideratque rotas pontisque intrauerat altos.
'iam iam fata, soror, superant, absiste morari;
quo deus et quo dura uocat Fortuna sequamur.
stat conferre manum Aeneae, stat, quidquid acerbi est,
morte pati, neque me indecorem, germana, uidebis
amplius. hunc, oro, sine me furere ante furorem.'

(*A.* 12.665-80)

Stunned and confused by the world's shifting image,
Turnus stood silently staring; in one heart
Surges immense shame, and madness mingled with grief,
And love whipped up by rage, and conscious valour.
As soon as shadows parted and light returned to the mind,
He turned his eyes' blazing orbs to the ramparts
Frantic and looked back at the great city from his chariot.
Look! from floor to floor a rolling spire of flame
Was billowing upwards and clutching a tower,
A tower which he had raised himself from jointed beams

And set on rollers and laid with high gangways:
'Now, now, sister, the fates prevail; do not hold me back.
Let us follow where god and hard Fortune call.
I am resolved to fight Aeneas, to suffer in death
All its bitterness; you'll see me, sister, shamed
No more. Let me, I beg, rage this final rage.'

The clouds of confusion dissipate. A tower which Turnus had built and emblem of much of his past life and purposes (*A*. 12.674-75) burns before his eyes and, as it does so, it generates in the Italian hero an insight into the inevitable imminence of his own destruction and a recognition that the engagement with Aeneas, which he must now face because of his own honour (*pudor*, *A*. 12.667, *neque ... indecorem*, *A*. 12.679) and grief for his people (*luctu*, *A*. 12.667), will be but an exercise in futile heroics, empty *furor* in his chariot:

stat conferre manum Aeneae, stat, quidquid acerbi est,
morte pati, neque me indecorem, germana, uidebis
amplius. hunc, oro, sine me furere ante furorem.
(*A*. 12.678-80)

I am resolved to fight Aeneas, to suffer in death
All its bitterness; you'll see me, sister, shamed
No more. Let me, I beg, rage this final rage.

Augmented by the resonances of Turnus' previous speech to Juturna (*A*. 12.632-49) — its fortitude, compassion, affirmation of honour, its contemplation of imminent and cruel death (*letum crudele*, *A*. 12.636) — the sense of high tragedy is unmistakable. As are Virgil's sympathies.[49]

What Book 12 in fact presents is the total collapse of the imperial ideology. Turnus, the embodiment of *furor* (and announced as such in *A*. 12.1-106), is yet a sympathetic character and one who develops to such an extent during the book that in the end it is he, not Aeneas, who manifests the essential *pietas*; whereas Aeneas, who in words and gestures is announced at the start of Book 12 (see esp. *A*. 12.175ff., 311ff.) as the symbol of *pietas*, has degenerated by the end of the book into an unambiguous instance of *furor*. The stark contrast between the merciless nature of Aeneas' final action and the *pietas* (both 'pity' and 'sense of duty') shown by Turnus towards his fellow-countrymen (*A*. 12.653ff.) and his father, Daunus (*A*. 12.934) — a contrast made the more severe by the emphasis throughout Book 12 on compassion as a prime human virtue (*cf.* *A*. 12.43, 243, 653, 777, 934) — draws indisputable attention to Aeneas' neglect of the clemency axiom (*parcere subiectis*, 'to spare the humbled', *A*. 6.853) revealed to him by Anchises in the apocalypse of Book 6 (and specifically appropriate to Turnus' suppliant state: *humilis supplex*, *A*. 12.930), and provides by means of its accurate and detailed mimesis of

[49] For illuminating comments on this scene see Quinn [18] 330-32, Johnson [8] 148f.

experience potent, symbolic illustration of the dichotomy between the ideology and the practice of empire. It is a matter of the greatest significance that Aeneas' last speech in the poem (*A.* 12.947-49) exhibits none of the tragic insight displayed by Turnus at *A.* 12.676-80 (see also *A.* 12.894-95); the Trojan hero's[50] attempt to represent the killing of his Italian adversary as an act of *pietas* towards his former *alumnus*, Pallas, is conspicuous for the lack of awareness and understanding which it reveals. Evidencing the values for which empire in practice stands, the burial of sword in Turnus' breast (*condit*, *A.* 12.950) underscores the self-deception *realpolitik* demands and emblematises the founding of Rome (*dum conderet urbem*, *A.* 1.5; *Romanam condere gentem*, *A.* 1.33).[51]

Achievement and Cost

What then the value of fame? The disparity between achievement and cost, that is to say, the imbalance between the value of empire and fame and their cost in terms of individual tragedy and wastage, constitutes perhaps the most pervasive and arresting theme of the entire *Aeneid.*[52] It is not merely that Virgil presents the antinomies of glory and tragedy, fame and sacrifice, achievement and cost, success and failure, victory and defeat as part of the structure of things — with the implication that human wastage is a necessary concomitant, albeit an unfortunate one, of the fulfilment of the claims of history and Rome's destiny.[53] In the *Aeneid* there is a constant selection and organisation of material, accompanied by a prevailing emphasis, which conveys forcefully to the reader the hollowness of the promises which empire makes to the individual and their consequent failure to compensate for the human loss and suffering which the attempts to realise the claims of empire involve.

---

[50] Note the recurrence in Book 12 of 'Trojan' phrases in connection with Aeneas' conduct in battle (*Rhoeteius hostis*, *A.* 12.456, *Troius heros*, *A.* 12.502, *Tros Aeneas*, *A.* 12.723, *Dardanides*, *A.* 12.775) to suggest once more the resurrection of old Troy and of its code of frenzied, violent heroism.

[51] *Conderet*, *A.* 1.5, and *condit*, *A.* 12.950, are intelligently connected by J.W. Hunt, *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1973) 5. See also Di Cesare [13] 237, and D. Gillis, *Eros and Death in the Aeneid* (Rome 1983) 107 f.

[52] *Cf.* A. Parry, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2.4 (1963) 66-80 (reprinted in Commager [31] 107-23) and C.P. Segal, '*Aeternum per saecula nomen*: The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History', *Arion* 4 (1965) 617-57 and *Arion* 5 (1966) 34-72.

[53] In essentials the view of L. Feder, 'Vergil's Tragic Theme', *CJ* 49 (1953-54) 198. Equally mistaken seems the 'dualism' of critics such as Williams 'The Purpose of the Aeneid' [8] 32-36 and Johnson [8], who see the *Aeneid* as an exploration of the tension between the constituents of these antinomies without any indication of their disparity. Williams and Johnson, however, avoid the incoherent dualism of Hunt [51] 97 f.

Virgil's treatment, for example, of the famous episode in Book 1 (*A*. 1.453-93) where Aeneas and Achates are confronted with a pictorial representation of the Trojan war in a temple built by Dido places effective and insistent stress upon the individual loss and tragedy which the Greek and Trojan pursuit of fame and glory engendered:

namque sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo
reginam opperiens, dum quae fortuna sit urbi
artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem
miratur, uidet Iliacas ex ordine pugnas
bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem,
Atridas Priamumque et saeuum ambobus Achillem.
constitit et lacrimans 'quis iam locus,' inquit, 'Achate,
quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?
en Priamus. sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi,
sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
solue metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem.'
sic ait atque animum pictura pascit inani
multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine uultum.

(*A*. 1.453-65)

As he [Aeneas] scans each single object beneath the vast temple
Waiting for the queen, as he marvels at the city's
Fortune, the rival craftsmen's work and the product
Of their toil, he sees Ilium's battles set out in order
And wars whose fame now had spread through all the world,
The Atridae and Priam, and Achilles savage to both.
He stopped and, crying, said, 'What place now, Achates,
What district on earth is not filled with our suffering?
Look! Priam! Even here are due rewards for worth,
There are tears for things and mortality touches the heart.
Away with fear; this fame will bring you some safety.'
So he speaks and feeds his soul on the futile picture
Heavily sighing, his face wet with a river's flood.

What follows is a description by Virgil of the pictures which Aeneas sees (*A*. 1.466-93) with no reference at all to the accolades, honours or repute won by the heroes at Troy; the emphasis is entirely upon violence, cruelty, blood-shed and death. It is important to realize that the description of the pictures is through Aeneas' eyes (*namque uidebat uti*, 'for he saw how ...', *A*. 1.466) and that the details selected and the resulting emphasis reflect Aeneas' own response. In the preceding lines (quoted above) Aeneas had shown himself aware of the paradoxical union of fame (*praemia laudi*, 461) and its cost in terms of human loss and suffering (*lacrimae rerum*, 462) and seemed to perceive the imbalance between the constituents of this union and to comprehend the extent to which what was lost at Troy far outweighed what was gained (*multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine uultum*, 465). The emphasis upon human tragedy and wastage in the description of the pictures themselves is the

inevitable extension of this insight, the pictures being as it were an objective correlative of Aeneas' own perceptions, a direct manifestation of the values of the private world — the values of compassion, understanding, friendship and love — to which the Trojan hero displays throughout the *Aeneid* an immense potentiality for commitment. Virgil's reference to the uselessness of the pictures (*pictura inani*, 464), that is to say, their inability to effect action,[54] marks a return to the earlier pessimism of the *Eclogues*,[55] and seems calculated to foreshadow ultimately on Aeneas' part conduct diametrically opposed to the values which they portray, conduct constituting a behavioural rejection of those values and exhibiting a most tragic obliviousness of the very thing which he perceives in Dido's temple at Carthage — the failure of the promises which history makes to the individual, the promises of fame and glory, to justify or even to offset in the smallest degree the human suffering and dissolution generated by their fulfilment.

The *pictura inanis* episode is no exception. Scene after scene of the *Aeneid* is carefully structured to ensure that the emphasis falls unequivocally upon individual tragedy and that the inadequacy of the compensation which fame offers to the individual is clearly revealed. In Book 2 Aeneas throughout his account of the fall of Troy chooses to stress not the glory achieved by Greek or Trojan but the horror, despair, blood-shed, suffering, agony and wastage which the destruction of the city engendered. Even his own actions are portrayed in terms of futile, violent heroism.[56] His reaction to the sight of Troy in flames typifies (*cf. A.* 2.336-38, 347-54, 575-88, 655-72):

tum uero manifesta fides, Danaumque patescunt
insidiae. iam Deiphobi dedit ampla ruinam
Volcano superante domus, iam proximus ardet
Vcalegon; Sigea igni freta lata relucent.
exoritur clamorque uirum clangorque tubarum.
arma amens capio; nec sat rationis in armis,
sed glomerare manum bello et concurrere in arcem

---

[54] Hence Aeneas becomes a second *saeuus Achilles* (*A.* 1.458) despite the insistence in the pictures upon the futile and tragic slaughter which Achilles perpetrated. See above p. 103 and further pp. 154-56. I do not, however, wish to suggest that the only implication of *inani is* 'inability to effect action'. *Pictura inani* also connotes the 'worthlessness' of the pictures in that the fame (*praemia laudi, A.* 1.461) which they bestow on the individual does not compensate for the loss incurred. *Inanis* is one of the key words of the *Aeneid*, as one would expect in a poem that seems to deal primarily with the issue of human failure. For another approach to *pictura inani* see Parry [52] 80. Johnson's thesis [8] 105, that *pictura inani* reveals 'the essential fraudulence of art. ..., reminds us that art is an illusion', takes no cognisance of the correlations between the scenes on the frescoes and later events in the poem, and seems difficult to reconcile with Virgil's evident commitment throughout his entire poetic career to art's didactic function.

[55] See above pp. 32-35.

[56] See Quinn's excellent comments [18] 17-22.

cum sociis ardent animi; furor iraque mentem
praecipitat, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.

(*A*. 2.309-17)

Then indeed the truth stands revealed and Danaan treachery
Disclosed. Already Deiphobus' large house has collapsed
As Vulcan towers above; already next door
Ucalegon's burns; Sigeum's wide straits glow with fire.
Shouts of men and the blaring of trumpets rise.
Mindless I snatch up arms; arms make little sense,
But my spirits burn to gather a force for battle
And rush to the citadel with my comrades; rage and anger
Impel my mind; death in arms seems beautiful.

No Diomedean *aristeia* here. Aeneas is all vulnerability and mindlessness. The violence of the final night of Troy is shown as impinging on Aeneas' consciousness until he himself becomes swept up in its driving chaos, taking in through his senses the violent clamour and blazing destruction all around him (*ardet*, 311, *ignis*, 312, *ardent*, 316). The external violence internalised (*furentibus*, *A*. 2.304, *furor*, 316), he himself becomes both victim and agent of the forces of annihilation at work in the city. The gap between heroic ideal and heroic reality, between the values of the heroic vision, the ideal of glory in arms (*pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis*, 'and death in arms seems beautiful', 317), and the uncontrollable, futile, violent mindlessness of heroic behaviour, is finely portrayed.

The arresting self-criticism throughout Book 2 (it should not be forgotten that the second *Aeneid* is Aeneas' own account of the fall of Troy) accords precisely with Aeneas' perception in the fresco-scene of Book 1 of the hollowness of fame as a value, and foreshadows his temporary abandonment of the search for Italy. It is typical of Aeneas' whole narrative that in the description of the encounter between himself and the shade of Creusa at the conclusion of the book (*A*. 2.771-95) the impression which he (and through him Virgil) is concerned to convey is not the greatness of the renown for which Creusa's death is a necessary sacrifice but the enormity of the personal loss and suffering which he experienced. Like Orpheus at the edge of the underworld, whose anguish is here recalled (*G*. 4.499-502), Aeneas experiences only loss and dissolution:

haec ubi dicta dedit, lacrimantem et multa uolentem
dicere deseruit, tenuisque recessit in auras.
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par leuibus uentis uolucrique simillima somno.

(*A*. 2.790-94)

When she had said this, though I was weeping and had much
To say, she left and faded into the thin air.
Three times I tried to put my arms round her neck;

Three times the image slipped my hands, my vain embrace,
Like the weightless winds or the fleeting of a dream.

Haunting sounds and movement, modulated, controlled rhythm, terse descriptive precision, juxtaposed with a simile that sends the imagination climbing into the air and onto the winds. Baffled effort and insubstantiality; immense and frustrated sorrow. It is upon this note of personal frustration, emptiness and despair — a note to be repeated elsewhere in identical terms (*A*. 6.700-2) — that the book concludes. Any idea that the fame which history bestows compensates for the personal deprivation which those who achieve it endure or, indeed, any suggestion that the magnificence and the glory of empire (or, to be more specific, of the new Troy) make ample reparation for the sufferings which are its birth-pangs is utterly alien to the tone, atmosphere and explicit comment of this book. What was for others a subject to be celebrated in heroic lays is for Aeneas the source of indescribable grief (*infandum dolorem*, *A*. 2.3).

In Book 3 the note of frustration increases as the Aeneadae wander in search of a promised kingdom which so frequently seems to slip from their grasp, even as they think that they possess it. And, as if to intensify the strange melancholy of this book, Virgil chooses the long, central episode at Buthrotum (*A*. 3.294-505) to question the value of the object of their mission — the value of the new Troy which they seek.[57] For at Buthrotum a new Troy has been built by Helenus and Andromache (see esp. *A*. 3.302, 349-51), but there is no satisfaction or sense of fulfilment in the achievement; what is suggested potently and unambiguously is the hollowness of life within the resurrected city — no transfiguration, just living death. The tableau of Andromache by the waters of a make-believe Simois offering gifts of mourning to Hector's empty tomb (*A*. 3.300-5), the specific details of the description which follows — her fainting, her lamentations, her cries, her curse upon life (306-44) — serve to affirm the vacuous nature of the achievement. The expression, *tumulum inanem* ('the empty tomb [of Hector]', *A*. 3.304), seems to connote not merely the emptiness of the tomb (the ashes are not within it) but also its uselessness,[58] its failure to make reparation for the loss of Hector. This monument to Hector's memory and symbol of his fame can in no sense compensate for his death. Even in a new Troy renown and glory seem as insubstantial as the wind.

Book 4 is concerned with the tragedy of Dido; it is entirely devoted to a dramatic narrative which illustrates in vivid, personal terms the cost of the

---

[57] It seems pointless to argue (as Otis [1] 260-61) that Virgil's intention in this episode is to mark 'the strongest contrast' between Aeneas' new Troy, Rome, and that of Helenus and Andromache, unless there are clear indications that in the final books of the *Aeneid* Virgil is concerned to portray his hero as avoiding the mistake of building a new Troy in terms of the old. The evidence of the battle-books of the *Aeneid* (*A*. 9-12) in fact supports the opposite contention.

[58] *Cf*. Quinn [18] 129: 'Observe how the pathos of the scene is drawn out by delaying the key word *inanem*, line 304 (with its usual ambiguity — (1) "empty"; (2) "useless")'.

pursuit of imperial greatness. The emphasis in this book is predominantly (though not entirely) upon the personal sufferings of Dido, with whom Virgil's sympathy predominantly (though not entirely) lies.[59] Strong sympathy is elicited for Dido, and elicited intentionally, by the poet's use of such overtly emotive adjectives as *infelix* ('luckless', 'ill-starred', *A*. 4.68, 450, 529, 596 — *cf.* *A*. 1.712, 749 and *A*. 6.456), *moritura* ('destined to die', *A*. 4.308, 415, 519, 604) and *misera* ('misfortunate', *A*. 4. 315, 420, 429, 697 *cf.* *A*. 1.344, 719 and *miserrima*, *A*. 4.117), by his pervasive employment of prescriptive imagery (especially the flame, storm, wound and hunting images[60] — see, e.g., *A*. 4.66-73 and *A*. 4.160-68), and by the thematic emphasis resulting from Virgil's concentration upon Dido's psychological torment following her discovery of Aeneas' plans for departure (*A*. 4.296ff.) — plans deliberately concealed (*A*. 4.287ff.) — and his graphic and meticulous description of the preparations for suicide to which these sufferings give rise (esp. *A*. 4.504-21). The simile at *A*. 4.401ff.,[61] comparing the Trojans' preparations for departure to the movement of ants carrying plunder (*praedam*, A. 4.404) from a ravaged heap of corn, seems further manifestation of Virgil's attitude, as does the telling contrast, emphasised by scenic juxtaposition, between the 'luckless' or 'ill-starred' (*infelix*, *A*. 4.529) Dido, prevented from sleeping by her intense distress and anguish (*A*. 4.522-53), and the 'resolute' (*certus*, *A*. 4.554) Aeneas, asleep on the deck of his ship (*A*. 4.554ff.). Nor is it merely a question of sympathy being evoked for an unfortunate accident of fate. The tragic non-fulfilment in Book 4 of the prayer which Aeneas earlier in the poem (*A*. 1.603-5), in gratitude for Dido's generous and humane treatment of the Trojans, offered for her prosperity directs the readers's attention to the moral injustice of Dido's plight:

> di tibi, si qua pios respectant numina, si quid
> usquam iustitiae est et mens sibi conscia recti,
> praemia digna ferant.
>
> (*A*. 1.603-5)

[59] Though this has been much disputed, e.g. by Feder [53] 203 ff., Otis [1] 264 ff., and Anderson [43] 43-49. D. R. Dudley, 'A Plea for Aeneas', *G&R* n.s. 8 (1961), 56 ff., seems to have the balance right, though his view that Aeneas' achievements in the second half of the poem justify his behaviour in Book 4 seems to me utterly untenable. The concise and similarly balanced account of R. G. Austin in his edition of *Aeneid* IV (Oxford, 1955), xi-xvii, is unfortunately spoilt by a Christian interpretation of Aeneas' mission.

[60] On the recurrence of flame, wound and hunting images in Book 4 and related images associated with the notions of capture or conquest see F. L. Newton, 'Recurrent Imagery in *Aeneid* IV', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 31-43. See also Anderson [43] 43-44, and below pp. 129 f.

[61] Hornsby [48] 49 f. has difficulty in reconciling this simile with his pro-Aeneas interpretation. He thus unconvincingly designates it as 'from Dido's point of view'.

If any powers respect the good (*pios*)[62], if justice
Exists anywhere and mind aware of right,
May the gods bring you due reward.

If Dido's treatment in Book 4 at the hands of Aeneas and his divine collaborators is the 'due reward' for the charity and generosity exhibited in Book 1, then the moral justification of that which is the cause of her tragedy — the pursuit of empire and of fame — and the moral structure of the metaphysical machinery which lies behind it are seriously and decisively questioned.

This inevitably is to oversimplify. It is true, for example, that Virgil elicits considerable sympathy for Aeneas especially in the careful delineation of the emotional torment and conflict which Aeneas feels at having to leave the woman he loves:

at pius Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem
solando cupit et dictis auertere curas,
multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore
iussa tamen diuum exsequitur classemque reuisit.
(*A.* 4.393-96)

But *pius* Aeneas, though he desires to soften
And comfort her pain and dispel her misery with words,
Heavily sighing and shaken to the heart by deep love,
Fulfils the gods' behests and returns to the fleet.

It is true also that *in a sense* Dido is responsible for her own tragedy;[63] her love for Aeneas forces her to ignore her reputation amongst her people —

ille dies primus leti primusque malorum
causa fuit; neque enim specie famaue mouetur
nec iam furtiuum Dido meditatur amorem:
coniugium uocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam.
(*A.* 4.169-72)

That day was the first cause of death, first of ruin.
For neither appearance nor reputation
Move Dido now; she no longer plans secret love,
Calls it marriage, covers her fault with this word.

---

[62] And 'good' in the sense primarily of 'compassionate'. For *pios* = 'compassionate' here see Johnson [6] 360f. For an alternative way of construing this passage — based on taking *mens* as joint subject with *di* of *ferant* — see Williams [12] 15 and 211, against which see R. G. Austin's edition of *Aeneid* I (Oxford 1971) *ad loc.* The point at issue is unaffected.

[63] But only 'in a sense'. Too much seems to be made of this by Anderson [43] 45ff., K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (London 1963) 29-58, and Hornsby [48] 89-100, 114; perhaps too little by N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1976) 32-53. Rudd seems to oversimplify when he writes (p. 49): 'What brings disaster is not Dido's guilt but her love of Aeneas. Everything comes back to that'. True, but Dido's self-conscious guilt (however 'old-fashioned' her reverence for the ideal of *uniuiratus* might have been, as Rudd argues pp. 42ff.) is still an important factor (*causal*) in her suicide: see esp. *A.* 4.457ff., 550-52, 596.

— and to sacrifice her integrity (crucial lines here are: *A*. 4. 24-29, 55, 91, 194, 321-23, 457-61, 550-52, 596). But if the Venus-Cupid incident of Book 1 (*A*. 1.657ff.) means anything,[64] it is that Dido's passion for Aeneas is something which she cannot control and of which she is the victim. And it is this notion of Dido as a victim[65] — a victim of the gods, of Aeneas, and of the exigencies of empire — which is perhaps the most dominant motif of Book 4 (note particularly in this connection the Venus-Juno colloquy, *A*. 4.90ff., with its imagery of guile, conquest and capture, and the recurrent wound, hunting and capture imagery of the book) and which is the prime source of Virgil's and the reader's sympathy. In a fairly clear sense Dido symbolises the private world, the world of the individual, and its values, and her victimisation seems to suggest that it is not simply the case that men such as Aeneas have to sacrifice their personal desires to enable the new order of imperial greatness to commence,[66] but rather that the exploitation or simple eradication of that world and its values is endemic to, and the cost of, the pursuit of empire and of fame. Certainly at any rate it is upon the cost of this pursuit that Virgil wishes to dwell in the final lines of Book 4, in which the moral focus of the fresco-scene preceding Dido's entrance in Book 1 (*A*. 1.453ff.) repeats itself in the queen's agonised exit:

tum Iuno omnipotens longum miserata dolorem
difficilisque obitus Irim demisit Olympo
quae luctantem animam nexosque resolueret artus.
nam quia nec fato merita nec morte peribat,
sed misera ante diem subitoque accensa furore,
nondum illi flauum Proserpina uertice crinem
abstulerat Stygioque caput damnauerat Orco.
ergo Iris croceis per caelum roscida pennis
mille trahens uarios aduerso sole colores
deuolat et supra caput astitit. 'hunc ego Diti
sacrum iussa fero teque isto corpore soluo':
sic ait et dextra crinem secat, omnis et una
dilapsus calor atque in uentos uita recessit.

(*A*. 4.693-705)

Then almighty Juno, pitying her long anguish
And hard going, sent Iris down from Olympus
To release the struggling soul from the twined limbs.
For since she was dying neither a fated nor deserved death

[64] The important notions of capture and deceit in this episode are well noted by Newton [60] 33.

[65] See Camps [6] 33-35.

[66] As Anderson [43] 47: 'But he [Virgil] expected his audience to distinguish intelligently, not sentimentally, between *infelix Dido*, tragic victim of her guilt and impossible circumstances, and *pius Aeneas*, unhappy, heroic servant of destiny who accepts the necessity of denying his own deepest emotions'.

But misfortunate before her time and fired by sudden rage,
Proserpina had not yet taken a yellow lock
From her head and assigned her life to Stygian Orcus.
So Iris on saffron wings, dew-glistening and trailing
A thousand shifting colours across the facing sun, flies down
Through the heavens and halts above her head. 'This offering to Dis
I take as bidden and release you from this body.'
So she speaks and with her right hand cuts the hair; at once
All warmth slipped away and life passed to the winds.

Virgil's felt emphasis is upon the untimeliness of Dido's death (it is unnatural — *nec fato*, 696 — and premature — *ante diem*, 697), its injustice (her death is undeserved — *merita nec morte peribat*, 696; *cf.* *A.* 6.475) and the human wastage incurred. Indeed the words and images chosen to describe Iris' descent to release Dido's soul (700-05) suggest — and suggest with compelling imaginative vigour — not only the sacrificial status of Dido's death (the victim's hair is cut) but the precise nature of what is sacrificed, the rich, joyous, elemental beauty of Dido's individual humanity, which, when the yellow tress is cut, is lost in air. If Dido is the cost and the desecration of deep love the means (*magno amore polluto*, *A.* 5.5f.), what value the achievement?

The focus upon the cost of the imperial process which Books 2 and 4 especially display is sharpened by manifest parallelisms between the tragic events of both books.[67] Motifs common to both narratives include those of hospitality betrayed, treachery, invidious capture (in Dido's case see esp. *A.* 4.90ff., *A.* 1.657ff.) and undeserved suffering (*cf.* *gentem immeritam*, *A.* 3.1f.; *merita nec morte*, *A.* 4.696); common images include fire, storm, wound (see below pp. 127-130) and sacrifice (*cf.* Laocoon as sacrificial victim at *A.* 2.222-24 with Dido at *A.* 4.704). The parallelisms are expressly cemented by similar tragic climaxes involving the loss of a woman Aeneas has loved (Creusa in Book 2, Dido in Book 4), and in each case Aeneas looks back too late (*cf.* *A.* 2.741, *A.* 5.3). So concerned is Virgil that the tragedies of Books 2 and 4 be linked in the reader's mind that, as Dido falls upon Aeneas' sword and Carthage resounds with lamentation, he compares the scene to the sacking and burning of a city:

lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu
tecta fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether,
non aliter quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis
Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes
culmina perque hominum uoluantur perque deorum.

(*A.* 4.667-71)

With weeping and groaning and women-shrieking
Houses roar, the heavens resound with great howlings:

---

[67] See Fenik [7] 1-24.

Just as if all Carthage or ancient Tyros
Were falling to an invading foe and raging flames
Were rolling across roofs of men and of gods.

It is small wonder that the hearts of the departing Trojans are filled with grim forebodings (*triste augurium*, *A*. 5.7). The cost of the mission is proving immense.

Dominating not only Books 2 and 4 but the entire first half of the *Aeneid* (even Book 5, a so-called 'lighter' book,[68] concludes with an episode [*A*. 5.833-71] in which the reader's attention is drawn not only to the human tragedy which is the cost of the fulfilment of Rome's destiny, but also to the moral injustice of the tragedy),[69] the cost-achievement disparity is powerfully and consistently reinforced in the last six books of the poem, most notably in Books 9-12. Since the emphasis in Books 9-12 upon the individual suffering generated by the rabid, violent actions of Trojan and Italian alike has been discussed above in another, though closely related, context, it will suffice here to draw attention to the focus in these books upon a specific and most pathetic sort of human loss — that incurred by the annihilation of the young.[70]

The Nisus-Euryalus episode of Book 9 (*A*. 9.176-502) furnishes a good example of this focus. Euryalus' youth is strongly underlined at the commencement of this episode[71] —

ora puer prima signans intonsa iuuenta

(*A* 9.181)

A boy whose unshaven face signalled his early youth

— and the ensuing discussion of motivation (*A*. 9.184ff.) with its emphasis upon the affirmed and unquestioned value of glory and renown — for Nisus the glory of the deed is enough (*facti/fama sat est*, *A*. 9.194-95), and Euryalus similarly is struck with a great desire for renown (*magno laudum percussus amore*, *A*. 9.197) — is intended by Virgil to be seen in the context of youth

---

[68] For the light-dark alternation theory in respect of the books of the *Aeneid* see R.S. Conway, 'The Architecture of the Epic', *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1928) 129-49, and the modified agreement expressed by G.E. Duckworth, 'The Architecture of the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 75 (1954) 5.

[69] Particularly important are the emphasis upon Palinurus' innocence (*insonti*, *A*. 5.841), his courage, loyalty and steadfastness (*A*. 5.847-53 and 856), his vain cries for help (*nequiquam saepe uocantem*, *A*. 5.860), and the injustice of Aeneas' remark at *A*. 5.870. The resistance of Palinurus (*cunctanti*, *A*. 5.856), as of Dido (*cunctantem*, *A*. 4.133), the golden bough (*cunctantem*, *A*. 6.211), Turnus (*cunctantem*, *A*. 7.449, *cunctanti*, *A*. 12.919), Vulcan (*cunctantem*, *A*. 8.388) and Aeneas himself (*cunctantem*, *A*. 12.940), to the exigencies of empire is of no avail: see p. 167f. below. On the resistance of the golden bough see Segal [38] 74-79.

[70] Foreshadowed by the Marcellus episode of Book 6 (860-86) which follows immediately upon the ideological maxims of Anchises. Note the emphasis in that episode upon Marcellus' youth (*iuuenem*, *A*. 6.861, *puer*, *A*. 6.875 and 882).

[71] *Cf.* the similar emphasis upon Euryalus' youth at *A*. 5.295-96.

(note the recurrence of *puer* at *A*. 9.217) and its intrinsic ambitiousness. The youth of the pair is again stressed at the Trojan council (*A*. 9.224ff.), when in response to Nisus' proposed plan — a plan which is asked to be judged by its merits and not by the age of its proponents (*A*. 9.234-36) — old Aletes praises the spirit of the youths (*animos iuuenum*, *A*. 9.249)[72] and Ascanius promises to reward the boy (*puer* again, *A*. 9.276), Euryalus, with a share in his quest for glory. Such emphasis upon youth, its promise and ambitiousness, increases the reader's sense of human wastage when the actions of Nisus and Euryalus lead to disaster; but, in order that the sense of tragedy resulting from the loss of these youths be almost total, the hollowness of the value of the *fama* and the *laudes* which the Trojan pair had sought and the moral repugnance of the imperial process for which they sacrificed their lives are brought sharply to the reader's attention by the forceful irony of Virgil's extravagant eulogy at *A*. 9.446-49 (the irony consists in the blatant appeal to the very values responsible for the destruction and death which Nisus and Euryalus perpetrated and to which inevitably they themselves were subject) and the emotive strength of the poet's concentrated description of the effect of the death of Euryalus upon his mother (*A*. 9.473ff.). In this latter passage great care is taken to show that the pain and anguish which Euryalus' mother feels at the loss of her son, the desolation and blind hopelessness of her life without him, so powerfully and pathetically demonstrated in her behaviour and prolonged lamentation, have such an overwhelming effect upon the army that it loses the will to fight:

hoc fletu concussi animi, maestusque per omnis
it gemitus, torpent infractae ad proelia uires.

(*A*. 9.498-99)

Her wailing stunned their minds; a moan of sorrow
Moves through all. Broken, their strength for the battle grows numb.

Wastage of such proportions nullifies the glory of battle. Momentarily, the imperial process is revealed to all as the creator of emptiness, suffering, despair.

Similar in the response it elicits from the reader is Virgil's description of the effect of the deaths of the youths,[73] Lausus and Pallas, upon Aeneas and their respective fathers, Mezentius and Evander (*A*. 10.821-71, *A*. 11.1-99, 139-81).

---

[72] *Iuuenis*, *iuuentus*, etc., need not always have the connotation of 'youth'; there are many cases where a military significance is the dominant one (see L. A. Mackay, 'Three Levels of Meaning in *Aeneid* VI', *TAPA* 86 [1955] 186 n. 8). However it can hardly be doubted that in a number of important passages the primary connotation intended by the poet is that of 'youth', together with the related associations of 'immaturity' and (in a sense) 'innocence': e.g. *A*. 6.861 (Marcellus); *A*. 9.181, 249, 399 (Nisus and Euryalus); *A*. 10.445, 464, *A*. 11.51, 67, 76, 156 (Pallas); *A*. 10.793, 796, 816 (Lausus); *A*. 12.19, 149, 221, 598 (Turnus — in his conflict with the non-*iuuenis*, Aeneas).

[73] Their youth is emphasized at important junctures by the use of *iuuenis* (see preceding note) and *puer* (*A*. 10.825 [Lausus], *A*. 11.42 [Pallas] — *cf*. *A*. 8.581 and *A*. 12.943). For the parallelism of their deaths and Virgil's implicit comment see Quinn [18] 341-43.

Aeneas' lament over the dead body of Pallas at the beginning of Book 11 (*A.* 11.42-58) seems particularly intended to heighten the disparity between achievement and cost:

non haec Euandro de te promissa parenti
discedens dederam, cum me complexus euntem
mitteret in magnum imperium ...
nos iuuenem exanimum et nil iam caelestibus ullis
debentem uano maesti comitamur honore.
(*A.* 11.45-47, 51-52)

These were not the promises I made for you to father
Evander as I left, when he embraced me as I went
Sending me to great empire ...
We attend a lifeless youth, one now indebted
To no gods, sorrowing and with useless honours.

The *honor* afforded the *iuuenis* is *uanus*, futile, empty, worthless, like the futile, empty tribute (*inani munere*, *A.* 6.885-86) Anchises pays to the *iuuenis*, Marcellus, at the conclusion of his ideological apocalypse in Book 6. Aeneas' remarks here, in fact, are almost an explicit statement that the loss incurred by Pallas' death is so much more than the hollow glory which he achieved[74] and, since the irony of the expression, *in magnum imperium* ('to *great* empire', 47), is nearly overt,[75] that it is also so much more than the value of the mission itself.

---

[74] Virgil himself confirms this at *A.* 11.62-63 in his comment upon the funeral procession to be sent to Evander: *solacia luctus/exigua ingentis* ('scant solace for huge grief'). The loss is great, the recompense small.

[75] There are strong indications within Aeneas' speech (*A.* 11.42-58) that the expression, *in magnum imperium* (47), is intended by Aeneas to have ironic overtones: the potent juxtaposition of the expression with the bitter reference to unfulfilled promises (45-46), the emphasis upon the idle hopes (*spe inani*, 49) of Evander, and the explicit comment upon the worthless nature of the *honor* paid to the now lifeless Pallas (51-52). Aeneas' acknowledgement here of the hollow nature of repute, fame and glory contrasts sharply with the naivety displayed in his speech over the dead body of Lausus (*A.* 10.825-30 — discussed above p. 95 f.). His claim on that occasion that Lausus would find solace in the glory of being slain by the hand of great Aeneas (*A.* 10.829-30) cannot be taken as ironic; any attempt to ascribe to Aeneas in those lines a basic disillusionment with the values of his mission (which the irony interpretation would suggest) would find support neither in the speech itself nor in Aeneas' behaviour immediately consequent upon the speech (note particularly 1. Aeneas' killing of Lausus' father, Mezentius, in a contest which he anticipates with joy [*laetus*, *A.* 10.874], and which he concludes with a cruel taunt [*A.* 10.897-98]; 2. Aeneas' failure to be moved by the death of Mezentius; 3. Aeneas' failure to reflect upon the implications of both that death and the deaths of Lausus and the other Italians he has killed — when the opportunity is given him to do so at the beginning of Book 11). The problem of the development of Aeneas' psychology is a complex one and discussion is reserved for the next chapter; but it is worth mentioning here that the insights exhibited by Aeneas in his speech over the body of Pallas are elicited by the demands of a very particular context (the boy who was *his* responsibility lies dead before him) and by the enormous guilt feelings which this particular context arouses in him. These insights are in fact very restricted and, as it turns out, evanescent. They fail to produce a wider understanding in Aeneas of the implications of his own behaviour and consequently leave unaltered and undiminished both the destructive nature of his conduct (*A.* 11.81-82) and the

Indeed it is clear that, since Aeneas' opening words to Pallas, *miserande puer* ('pitiable lad', *A.* 11.42), recall the identical terms of his own address to the dead Lausus (*A.* 10.825) and Anchises' address to the doomed youth, Marcellus (*A.* 6.882), Pallas' death is intended to stand as a symbol of the sacrifice of the young and the disparity between the loss incurred by that sacrifice and the value of the *magnum imperium* thereby achieved.

But Pallas is not by any means the last example of empire's sacrifice of the young. The second half of Book 11 is devoted to the martial exploits and tragic death of the young warrior-maiden, Camilla, and Virgil strongly evokes the pathos and cruelty of her death by a repeated emphasis upon her virginity[76] (*A.* 11.507, 508, 565, 583, 604, 664, 676, 718, 762, 778, 791, 804, 808, 841) — with its connotations of youth and unfulfilled promise — and the master-stroke of having her killed by the cowardly and vainglorious fanatic,[77] Arruns (*A.* 11.759-867, see esp. 759-67, 783-93, 806-14, 854). Further intensification of the sense of loss resulting from Camilla's death comes from Diana's tribute at *A.* 11.841ff. For what Diana promises in recompense — fame, a name among nations (*neque hoc sine nomine letum/per gentis erit*, *A.* 11.846-47) — seems small compensation for the excessive cruelty (*nimium crudele supplicium*, *A.* 11.841-42) of Camilla's death and suffering, with the emotive description of which (*A.* 11.816-31) Diana's speech is purposefully juxtaposed, and seems no compensation at all for the loss of the free, virgin world of pastoral Italy which she so magnificently symbolises:[78]

illa uel intactae segetis per summa uolaret
gramina nec teneras cursu laesisset aristas,
uel mare per medium fluctu suspensa tumenti
ferret iter celeris nec tingeret aequore plantas.
(*A.* 7.808-11)

She could fly across the tallest blades of uncut
Corn, and not have bruised their tender ears as she ran;
She could skim across mid-ocean poised on the swelling
Wave, and not wet the flashing soles of her feet.

And in the concluding scene of Book 12 it is the turn of the young warrior, Turnus (*iuuenis*, *A.* 12.19, *iuuenem*, *A.* 12.149, *iuuenali in corpore*, *A.* 12.221,

---

firmness of his support for the mission (note that he is the first to recommence hostilities — *A.* 11.446 — and well before the completion of the twelve-day truce).

[76] Note also the emphasis upon the virginity of her comrades, both human and divine: *A.* 11.533, 536, 557, 655. The stress upon virginity in Book 11 serves also to reinforce the virgin-rape analogue for Aeneas' conquest of Italy (see above n. 38 and p. 167 below).

[77] See Quinn [18] 249.

[78] *Cf.* the emphasis upon her wild, rustic upbringing at *A.* 11. 570ff. Not that Camilla is purity *par excellence*; she is a warrior-maid, and Virgil never lets us forget this — her *aristeia* in *A.* 11 is as bloodthirsty and as merciless as that of any of the other leaders. Her pastoral myrtle (*pastoralem myrtum*, *A.* 7.817) — it should be remembered — is tipped with spear-point.

iuuenem, *A.* 12.598), to symbolise finally and definitively the cost in terms of human loss and suffering of the fulfilment of the claims of empire and of history. In this last scene (*A.* 12.919-52), which depicts the death of Turnus at the hands of Aeneas, the notion of achievement is totally absent and the emphasis falls entirely and unequivocally upon the personal tragedy of the Rutulian hero and the personal failure of the founder of Rome:

> hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
> feruidus; ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
> uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.
>
> (*A.* 12.950-52)

> As he speaks, he buries the steel full in Turnus' breast
> Burning. His limbs go limp with cold; with a groan
> The life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

The last line of the poem is used to describe Turnus' death and its words are identical with those which Virgil selected to depict the death of Camilla (*A.* 11.831). The *Aeneid* ends not upon a note of triumph, but upon one of loss, and it ends — specifically and symbolically — with the emphasis sharply upon the most unendurable of losses, the annihilation of the young. The disparity between achievement and cost receives final and definitive statement.

Image and Symbol

Image and symbol sustain this statement and underscore the poem's thematic discourse.[79] The fabric of the *Aeneid*'s narrative is permeated by such symbolic images as serpent, fire, wound, storm, gold, brightness, bee, ferocious beast, deer, hunting, sacrifice, dream, shadow, darkness,[80] which occur at important junctures of the epic, bring to particular contexts in which they appear associations derived from their occurrence in other contexts, and, so doing, serve to determine the reader's response to the events related in the main body of the narrative and (more importantly) to the issues which arise from them. The following brief discussion confined to two examples (they are *typical* examples) illustrates the way Virgil uses imagery to alienate the reader's sympathy from Aeneas and the claims of empire and history which he represents and to focus attention upon individual loss and suffering and the non-fulfilment of Rome's ideology.

---

[79] Works on Virgil's imagery include: V. Pöschl. *Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis* (Innsbruck 1950 — trans. G. Seligson, Ann Arbor 1962), Knox [31], R.A. Brooks, '*Discolor Aura*: Reflections on the Golden Bough', *AJP* 74 (1953) 260-80 (reprinted in Commager [31] 143-63), Newton [60], Fenik [7], Putnam [28], Poe [15], Segal [52], Hornsby [48], and M.D. Northrup, 'Like Dreams that Delude the Sleeping Senses: Aeneas' Moral Failure and Vergil's Imagery of the Insubstantial', *Ramus* 7 (1978) 26-37.

[80] On the last three see especially Northrup [79].

The first example is simple; it involves the use of a single image-symbol, that of the deer. Leaving aside the seven deer which Aeneas kills as soon as he arrives on the cost of Africa (*A.* 1.184-93), there are only three passages in the *Aeneid* where the image of a deer, be it stag (*ceruus*) or doe (*cerua*), appears in any developed form.[81] At *A.* 4.69-73 Dido, desperately in love with Aeneas, is compared to a doe (*cerua*, *A.* 4.69), wounded by an unwary hunting shepherd (*pastor nescius*, *A.* 4.71-72), i.e. Aeneas. At *A.* 12.749-55 Turnus, being pursued by Aeneas, is compared to a stag (*ceruum*, *A.* 12.750), being hunted by a hound. Between these two important passages occurs the slaying of the pet stag (*ceruus*, *A.* 7.483) of the family of Tyrrhus by Ascanius (*A.* 7.475ff.) — an act explicitly stated to be (*prima laborum causa*, *A.* 7.481f.) the proximate cause of the war in Latium:

ceruus erat forma praestanti et cornibus ingens,
Tyrrhidae pueri quem matris ab ubere raptum
nutribant Tyrrhusque pater, cui regia parent
armenta et late custodia credita campi.
adsuetum imperiis soror omni Siluia cura
mollibus intexens ornabat cornua sertis,
pectebatque ferum puroque in fonte lauabat.
ille manum patiens mensaeque adsuetus erili
errabat siluis rursusque ad limina nota
ipse domum sera quamuis se nocte ferebat.
hunc procul errantem rabidae uenantis Iuli
commouere canes, fluuio cum forte secundo
deflueret ripaque aestus uiridante leuaret.
ipse etiam eximiae laudis succensus amore
Ascanius curuo derexit spicula cornu;
nec dextrae erranti deus afuit, actaque multo
perque uterum sonitu perque ilia uenit harundo.
saucius at quadripes nota intra tecta refugit
successitque gemens stabulis, questuque cruentus
atque imploranti similis tectum omne replebat.

(*A.* 7.483-502)

Was a stag, a splendid creature and mighty antlered,
Which had been removed from its mother's dugs and nursed
By Tyrrhus' boys and father Tyrrhus himself, who was master
Of the royal herds and warden of the wide pastures.
Their sister Silvia dressed it, grown used to her commands,
With all care, wreathing its antlers with soft garlands;
She groomed the wild thing and bathed it in clear springs.
Meek to her touch and used to the master's table

[81] It is true that deer are mentioned elsewhere, but only briefly and generally in insignificant or unrelated contexts: *A.* 5.253, *A.* 6.802, *A.* 10.725. The brief reference at *A.* 4.154-55 to *cerui* in flight is, however, probably significant and related to the pattern of symbolism under discussion because of the simile at *A.* 4.69-73.

It roamed the woods and, however late the night,
Made its own way home back to the familiar door-step.
This creature, roaming far afield, the rabid dogs
Of huntsman Iulus startled, as it was floating downstream —
So it happened — and allaying the heat on a verdant bank.
He too was inflamed with passion for signal glory,
Ascanius, and he aimed an arrow from his curving bow.
Some god did not allow his hand to fail and the arrow
Driven, hissing loud, pierced both flank and belly.
Wounded, the animal fled to the familiar house,
Crept moaning into his stall and, bleeding, filled
The whole house with cries like some beseeching creature.

A deer would quite naturally be taken to suggest beauty, vulnerability and pastoral freedom, and, as if to insist upon what would in any case be the archetypal import of the deer image, it is these very notions that Virgil chooses to emphasise in his detailed description of the care-free domesticity of the pet stag which Ascanius kills (see esp. 483-92). Accordingly the effect of the poet's discriminate use of the deer image in the *Aeneid* is to bring together (this bringing together is important — each of the passages in which the deer image is developed recalls and/or foreshadows each of the others) the tragedies of Dido, Turnus and the pet stag of the family of Tyrrhus as instances of the Trojan destruction of what is vulnerable, beautiful and free and as examples of the helplessness of the individual and the inevitability of his annihilation by the forces of empire and history. What would otherwise have been simply imagistically arresting, if highly emotive, similes or episodes receive an escalation of meaning from their relationship to each other and, it should be added, from their combined relationship to the first decisive act performed by the poem's hero. For Aeneas' apparently innocuous slaying of seven deer on reaching the coast of Africa in Book 1 (*A.* 1.184ff.) proves in retrospect — like the hunting costume in which the imperial ancestress first presents herself to her son (*A.* 1.318ff.) — harbinger of tragic destruction to come. As in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, so in the *Aeneid* the meaning of an event or episode is clarified, augmented by its relationship to others.

The second example is more complex. It concerns the pervasive employment by Virgil not of a single image but of a constellation of thematically related images. The images which form this constellation are those of serpent, fire, wound and storm.

The symbolic import of the images of serpent, fire, wound and storm is fixed early on in the poem (in Books 1 and 2), where it becomes clear that they are to a very large extent imagistic representations of *furor*. The wound and storm images, for example, are associated with *furor* right at the start of the *Aeneid*, when they are used to describe on the one hand the cause of Juno's *furor* (*aeternum seruans sub pectore uulnus* — 'preserving an eternal wound beneath

her breast', *A*. 1.36)[82] and on the other its operation in the world (the storm which at *A*. 1.81ff. gives vent to Juno's wrath is an obvious symbol of the goddess' *furor* and is emphasised by Virgil as such — see esp. the simile at *A*. 1.148ff.). This association is confirmed by the few recurrences of these images in Book 2, where, though they are not the major images of the book, their connection with the forces of violence and destruction is clear. Particularly important are the depiction of the raging (*furentem*, *A*. 2.499) Pyrrhus pressing upon his foe *infesto uulnere* ('with a wound in threat', *A*. 2.529), the portrayal of Priam gasping out his life *crudeli uulnere* ('beneath a cruel wound', *A*. 2.561), and the similes at *A*. 2.304ff. and 416ff., in which storm analogues are used to depict in one case (304ff) the sacking of Troy and in the other (416ff.) the fury of the Greeks as they fall upon Aeneas and his fellow-warriors (*cf.* also *A*. 2.278, 286, 336-38, 436, 496-99, 610ff., 630, 692f.).

Also connected significantly with Juno's first appearance in the poem (at *A*. 1.29 she is 'inflamed', *accensa*, and at *A*. 1.50 her heart is 'on fire', *flammato corde*) is the emotive image of fire or flame. This image recurs throughout Book 1 (e.g. *A*. 1. 174ff., 213, 472, 491, 515, 581) and culminates in the dense cluster of images suggestively attached to the disastrous passion with which Venus inflames Dido (*A*. 1. 660, 673, 688, 710, 713, 726-27) reducing her to a helpless victim of *furor* (*furentem*, *A*. 1.659). The association between *furor* and fire imagery which Book 1 reveals is consistently reinforced and sharpened by the numerous occurrences of the fire image in Book 2. Good examples are the episode discussed above (*A*. 2.302ff., esp. 314-17) in which the flames of the burning city spread from the buildings which they are consuming to Aeneas' own consciousness, rendering him a maddened creature of *furor*, and the pointed description of both Pyrrhus' desire to kill Polites (*ardens*,'ablaze', *A*. 2.529) and Aeneas' passion to slay Helen (*exarsere ignes animo*, 'fire blazed up in my heart', *A*. 2.575, and *ultricis flammae*, 'the flame of vengeance', *A*. 2.587) in terms of fire at work within them. Like the eternal wound of Juno in Book 1 (*aeternum uulnus*, *A*. 1.36), the eternal fire (*aeternum ignem*, *A*. 2.297) brought by Hector's spirit to the sleeping Aeneas pre-images events to come. Not only in Book 2.

As for the serpent image, it is to be noted that unlike the other members of this constellation of imagery its first major appearance is in Book 2, where in fact it appears so extensively that it functions in this book (together with the image of fire) as the major symbol of violence, rage and destructiveness.[83] Its

[82] The 'eternal' nature of Juno's wound seems to emphasise at the outset of the poem Virgil's belief that the annihilistic, violent and non-rational forces which Juno represents are a permanent constituent of the universe. *Cf.* the *aeternum uulnus* of Mars (Lucretius *DRN* 1.34) and of Cybele (*DRN* 2.639).

[83] See the excellent discussion in Knox [31] and Putnam [28] Chapter 1.

initial appearance in Book 2 is one of the most compelling scenes in Virgil, and deserves quotation in full:

> hic aliud maius miseris multoque tremendum
> obicitur magis atque improuida pectora turbat.
> Laocoon, ductus Neptuno sorte sacerdos,
> sollemnis taurum ingentem mactabat ad aras.
> ecce autem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta
> (horresco referens) immensis orbibus angues
> incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt;
> pectora quorum inter fluctus arrecta iubaeque
> sanguineae superant undas, pars cetera pontum
> pone legit sinuatque immensa uolumine terga.
> fit sonitus spumante salo; iamque arua tenebant
> ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine et igni
> sibila lambebant linguis uibrantibus ora.
> diffugimus uisu exsangues. illi agmine certo
> Laocoonta petunt; et primum parua duorum
> corpora natorum serpens amplexus uterque
> implicat et miseros morsu depascitur artus;
> post ipsum auxilio subeuntem ac tela ferentem
> corripiunt spirisque ligant ingentibus; et iam
> bis medium amplexi, bis collo squamea circum
> terga dati superant capite et ceruicibus altis.
> ille simul manibus tendit diuellere nodos
> perfusus sanie uittas atroque ueneno,
> clamores simul horrendos ad sidera tollit:
> qualis mugitus, fugit cum saucius aram
> taurus et incertam excussit ceruice securim.
> at gemini lapsu delubra ad summa dracones
> effugiunt saeuaeque petunt Tritonidis arcem,
> sub pedibusque deae clipeique sub orbe teguntur.
>
> (*A*. 2.199-227)

> Now something else more momentous and much more terrifying
> Is thrust at misfortunates and bewilders blind souls.
> Laocoon, drawn by lot as Neptune's priest,
> Was slaying a giant bull at consecrated altars,
> When — picture it — over the tranquil deep from Tenedos
> (I shudder to recount it) twin snakes with endless coils
> Press upon the sea and side-by-side drive towards the shore.
> Breasts erect amid the surf, their blood-red crests tower
> Over the waves; the rest of them skims the ocean
> Behind and their huge backs sinuously coil.
> The salt-surge foams and seethes. Now they were gaining
> The fields and, eyes blazing, shot-through with blood and fire,
> They licked their hissing jaws with flickering tongues.
> We scatter, bloodless at the sight. They, in unswerving line,
> Make for Laocoon. At first each serpent
> Enfolds in its embrace the tiny bodies
> Of his two sons, and bites and feeds on piteous flesh.

Next they seize Laocoon, as he comes to help,
Carrying weapons, and bind him with giant folds.
Twice they encircle his waist, twice entwine his throat
With scaly backs, their heads and steep necks towering above.
All the while with bare hands he struggles to tear their knots,
His headbands spattered with filth and black venom;
All the while he lifts hideous cries to the stars,
Like the bellowings of a wounded bull who has fled
The altar and shaken from his neck an ill-aimed axe.
Sliding away the twin snakes escape to high sanctuary;
They make for savage Tritonia's citadel
And hide beneath the goddess' feet and the shield's circle.

This detailed, dramatic narrative of the killing of Laocoon and his sons by the twin serpents from Tenedos foreshadows and symbolically represents the fall of Troy itself. Verbal and thematic echoes of this passage are scattered throughout the book, associated with events and persons of obvious and specific importance. Trojan terror (*A.* 2.228f.), the entry of the wooden horse (*A.* 2.235ff.), the disastrous Trojan sleep (*A.* 2.253, 269), Deiphobus' blazing house (*A.* 2.311), Aeneas' fatal deception of Androgeos (*A.* 2.379-81), the Atridae (*A.* 2.415,500), Pyrrhus on the threshold of Priam's palace (*A.* 2.469-75), Pyrrhus' slaughter of Priam (*A.* 2.552), the Iulus portent (*A.* 2.681-84) — are all presented through verbal and/or thematic linking as in a sense narrative reverberations of the Tenedos serpent episode. The destruction of Priam's city is thus imaged as wrought and perpetrated by a serpent, the treacherous and ferocious nature of which seems to connote the treacherous and ferocious nature of the *furor* which erupts. The serpent image is also used to suggest rebirth, but it seems perverse to argue, as some critics do,[84] that the destructive connotations of this image, so consistently maintained and sharpened throughout Book 2, are absent in the Iulus-portent episode at *A.* 2.679ff. Rather the occurrence of the image there seems to connote that the rebirth of Troy will involve the rebirth of the violence and destruction displayed at the fall of the city.

Since therefore serpent, fire, wound and storm are fixed early on in the *Aeneid* as the major imagistic representations of *furor*, when they occur thereafter, as they do frequently throughout the epic, they serve generally to index its presence or rather the manic, ferocious, violent, and destructive nature of its presence. Such is clearly the case, for example, when they are used in Book 4 in association with Dido's passionate love for Aeneas and the behaviour to which this gives rise (wound, fire and storm images: *A.* 4.1-2,

---

[84] E.g. Knox [31] 397, Fenik [7] 13, Putnam [28] 39-41. See however, Poe [15] 328-29, who, despite Knox, believes that the imagery here suggests 'that the mission which Ascanius represents has its sinister aspects' (329).

23,54, 66-73, 101, 120-22, 160-68, 300, 360, 364, 376, 384, 441-46, 494, 504, 531-32, 564, 567, 593, 604-5, 626, 640, 646, 661, 670, 676, 683, 689, 697), in Book 7 in association with the start of the war in Latium (serpent, fire, wound and storm images permeate the whole of the Allecto episode, *A.* 7.323-571 — see esp. 329, 337, 345, 346-56, 374-75, 392-93, 397, 431, 445-50, 456-57, 462-66, 481-82, 496, 500, 528-30, 533, 550, 561), and in Books 9-12 in association with the conduct of the Italian and Trojan forces in the fighting that breaks out between them (wound, fire and storm images: *passim*). But perhaps the most important feature of this constellation of imagery (important in that its effect is to accent the dichotomy between empire's ideology and its practice) is the frequency with which Virgil employs it to describe the actions of Aeneas and the consequences of those actions. It is used, for example, in Book 2 in connection with Aeneas' senseless and frenzied heroics at Troy (serpent, fire and storm images: *A.* 2.302-17, 336-38, 379-81, 575ff.) and with his departure from Troy for fame and glory in Italy (serpent, fire and storm images; *A.* 2.679ff.). It is used in Books 1 and 4 in connection with Dido's love (fire, wound and storm images: see above), which Virgil emphatically portrays (*A.* 1.657ff., *A.* 4.90ff.) as a divinely rigged consequence of Aeneas' landing in Africa. It is used in Book 7 in connection with the start of the war in Latium (serpent, fire, wound and storm images: see above), which is the consequence of his landing in Italy and a direct result of Ascanius' shooting of the stag (note that Ascanius' motive in killing the stag is described in terms of the fire image — *eximiae laudis succensus amore*, 'inflamed with passion for signal glory', *A.* 7.496). It is used in Book 10 in connection with Aeneas' conduct in the battle-scenes of that book (fire, wound and storm images: *A.* 10. 260-75, 514, 552, 560, 565-70, 603-4, 788, 834, 842, 848, 850, 857), and in Book 12 again in connection with Aeneas' fighting (serpent, fire, wound, and storm images: *A.* 12.5, 167, 451ff., 521ff., 528, 531, 560, 573, 720, 748, 848, 921ff., 946, 948, 949, 951).

Further consideration of the associative import of this pattern of imagery is contained in the next chapter. But worthy of more detailed comment now is the way in which this constellation of images explodes in the final scene of the epic, the defeat and death of Turnus (*A.* 12.919-52). In the early lines of the scene Virgil uses the image of storm (*A.* 12.921ff.) to describe the spear-throw from Aeneas which fells the Italian hero; it is 'like a black hurricane' (*atri turbinis instar*, *A.* 12.923) — a comparison he had used before to describe Aeneas' vengeful bloodletting after the news of Pallas' death (*turbinis atri/more furens*, 'raging like a black hurricane', *A.* 10.603f.). But this is not the constellation's only member to appear in Virgil's minutely particularising account of the poem's final act:

ille, oculis postquam saeui monimenta doloris
exuuiasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira

terribilis: 'tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.'
hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
feruidus; ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

(*A*. 12.945-952)

He [Aeneas] — after his eyes drank in reminders of savage grief,[85]
The armour stripped — inflamed with rage and terrible
In his anger: 'Are you, decked with spoils of my comrades,
To be snatched from me? Pallas, Pallas with this wound
Sacrifices you and draws payment from guilty blood.'
As he speaks, he buries the steel full in Turnus' breast
Burning. His limbs go limp with cold; with a groan
The life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

Aeneas, as he kills Turnus, is portrayed as *furiis accensus* ('inflamed with rage', *A*. 12.946) and *feruidus* ('burning', *A*. 12.951); he represents Turnus' death as a sacrifice (*immolat*, *A*. 12.949)[86] through a wound (*hoc uulnere*, *A*. 12.948); even his final 'hissing sibilants' (*scelerato ex sanguine sumit*, 'draws from guilty blood' *A*. 12.949)[87] seem to intimate the presence of the serpent.[88] Like Gallus at the end of the *Eclogues* and Orpheus at the *Georgics*' close, Aeneas in the epic's final lines defines human *furor* in action. Psychological and imagistic precision allow neither ambivalence nor ambiguity. In this climactic explosion of image and symbol the reader's attention is focussed sharply upon the non-fulfilment of the imperial ideology and the reality of the forces which Aeneas represents. The death of Turnus may signify the victory of Aeneas, Rome and

[85] The functional semantic ambiguity of this phrase is well discussed by K. Quinn, 'Some Dying Words: Tragic Insight in the *Aeneid* and the Question of Virgil's Competence', *Aumla* 22 (1964) 179.

[86] *Immolat* recalls the theme of sacrifice which pervades the poem :Creusa, Dido, Palinurus, Misenus, Nisus, Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, Camilla, Amata, Turnus are all in a clear sense sacrifices. In particular *immolat* recalls Aeneas' conduct during his vendetta in Book 10 — his capture of eight Italian youths with the intention to offer them as living sacrifices (*quos immolet*, *A*. 10.519) to the shade of Pallas and his 'sacrificial' slaying (*immolat*, *A*. 10.541) of the son of Haemon, a priest of Phoebus and Trivia. It is surely not accidental that each instance of the verb, *immolo*, in the *Aeneid* (*immolat*, *A*. 10.541, *A*. 12.949, and *immolet*, *A*. 10.519) is used to describe a vindictive act of Aeneas. Anderson [43] 106 oddly regards the image of sacrifice at *A*. 12.949 as 'non-thematic'.

[87] Note the parallel phrase, *sceleratas sumere poenas* ('draw guilty payment', *A*. 2.576), used of Aeneas' clearly unjustified passion to kill Helen.

[88] The phrase 'hissing sibilants' is that of Anderson [43] 105, who does not however see their connection with the serpent image. For the association of sibilants and serpent see *A*. 2.209-11, 379f., 415, *A*. 5.84f., *A*. 7.374f., *A*. 11.753, *A*. 12.848. *Cf*. the use of three successive sibilants here in Aeneas' final words and in the thematically cardinal description of *Furor impius* at *A*. 1.295: *saeua sedens super*.

her empire, but it is Virgil's concern to emphasise that it is a victory for the forces of non-reason and the triumph, if of *pietas*, of *pietas* redefined as *furor*.[89]

---

[89] The final scene of the *Aeneid* has been much discussed. An excellent analysis can be found in Anderson [43] 101-9, though his view that Aeneas' conduct is something of a momentary aberration is at odds with the facts of the poem (most notoriously the vendetta of Book 10). For other anti-Aeneas interpretations of this final scene see R. Beare, 'Invidious Success: Some Thoughts on the End of the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 5 (1964-65) 18-30, Putnam [28] 200-1, Quinn [18] 271-76, D. A. Little, 'The Death of Turnus and the Pessimism of the *Aeneid*', *Aumla* 33 (1970) 67-76. For modern exponents of the traditional (*vid.* Donatus on *A.* 12.947-49 and Servius on *A.* 12.940) pro-Aeneas attitude to this passage see A. H. Thornton, 'The Last Scene of the *Aeneid*', *G&R* 22 (1953) 82-84, Feder [53] 208, G. E. Duckworth, 'Fate and Free Will in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CJ.* 51 (1955-56) 362, Otis [1] 379-82, Camps [6] 29, Hornsby [48] 138-40, and Di Cesare [13] 236-39. The latest attempt to exonerate Aeneas in this final scene — Williams [12] 221-25 — purposefully takes no account of the scene's relationship to the imperial programme of Book 6: see M. C. J. Putnam's review, *AJP* 105 (1984) 228-31. On Aeneas' deformed *pietas* in this final scene see pp. 158 f. below.

CHAPTER FIVE

EPIC VISION: THE *AENEID* (2)

The sixth *Aeneid* is the noetic core of the poem. It is the centre of the *Aeneid*, and the centre not only of the narrative movement of the poem but also (and more significantly) of its thematic movement, its exploration, development and analysis of the ideas and issues experientially presented in the narrative. It is what one might call a 'meta-book', that is to say, a book which provides a commentary upon other books and which, in so doing, furnishes the reader with a framework of judgment and evaluation with which to interpret and to understand the noetic content of the poem. The sixth *Aeneid* and its thematic ramifications demand critical address.

Daedalus and the Ivory Gate

At a fairly overt level Book 6 of the *Aeneid* is concerned with the psychological preparation of Aeneas for the mantle of empire — with the redirection of his attitudes from the past to the future, with the transformation of his responsibilities from personal to social, with in fact his Romanisation. Prior to Book 6 Aeneas has revealed himself as a somewhat reluctant servant of Rome's destiny. His behaviour in Books 1-5 has shown him to be no archetypal empire-man, but rather a vulnerable, sensitive, melancholic, reflective, self-critical individual, obsessed with the past (e.g. *A.* 1.94-101), uncertain of the future (e.g. *A.* 5.700-04), possessing an immense potentiality for deep, personal involvement (Creusa, Dido, Anchises), exceptionally responsive to the tragedy of individual suffering and annihilation (e.g. *A.* 1.220ff., 459ff., *A.* 2.790ff., *A.* 3.709ff., *A.* 4.393-95, *A.* 5.869), and able to progress through the various stages of his journey to Italy chiefly because at each crucial step in the movement from Troy to Cumae there were motives of a positively personal kind to drive him onwards.[1] In Book 6 however Aeneas experiences what might be construed as a spiritual regeneration;[2] he gains access to the full ideology of his mission, is

[1] Aeneas leaves Troy in order to save his family (see esp. *A.* 2.559-63, 596-98, 635-36); he leaves Carthage primarily to fulfil his personal obligations to Anchises and Ascanius (*A.* 4.272-76, 351-55); he leaves Sicily again to fulfil his personal obligation to Anchises, but also in order that he may meet him once more (*A*, 5.722 ff.). Note that in the last mentioned instance Virgil focusses the reader's attention upon the personal nature of Aeneas' motivation by underlining the way in which Aeneas is unable to act upon Nautes' sound advice (*A.* 5.700-20, esp. 719-20) until told to do so by his father (in a very personal appeal, see *A.* 5.724-25) and given the further personal incentive of a meeting with him in Elysium. Aeneas then acts straight away (*extemplo*, *A.* 5.746).

[2] As, for example, by W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (London 1911) 419, L.A. Mackay, 'Three Levels of Meaning in *Aeneid* VI', *TAPA* 96 (1955) 184,

made cognisant of the promises which empire vouchsafes for the future, and returns to his task as the conscious, unfaltering bearer of the imperial destiny of Rome, with which —

> tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
>
> (*A*. 6.851)
>
> You, Roman, remember to rule nations with your command

— he is directly linked. Book 6 is thus a turning-point in the development of Aeneas' psychology, and a turning-point upon which Virgil chooses to dwell at some length. For the ideological apocalypse which precedes Aeneas' 'conversion' occurs in the concluding section of the book, and before it takes place Virgil devotes time, space and considerable poetic energy to a detailed and symbolic confrontation by Aeneas with his own past. This confrontation with the past deserves immediate comment.

In the Hades section of the underworld Aeneas encounters three figures from his past whose function seems partly at least to symbolise different aspects of Aeneas' previous psychology and behaviour from which he must now dissociate himself. These are the figures of Palinurus (*A*. 6.337-83), Dido (*A*. 6.450-76), and Deiphobus (*A*. 6.494-547). Palinurus points to the period of Aeneas' wanderings and the uncertainty and the absence of confidence in his mission which was the hall-mark of that period. Dido reminds us — on one level at least (the ideological level)[3] — of Aeneas' 'irresponsibility' in succumbing at the expense of his mission to the private world of sexual, emotional and personal fulfilment. Deiphobus conjures up all the associations of Aeneas' Trojan past — especially his penchant for blind, unthinking rage, battle-lust and senseless heroics (see esp. *A*. 2.302-17, 336-38, 575ff.). Deiphobus is the last ghost from the past whom Aeneas encounters in Hades. His parting words to the Trojan hero are crucial:

> 'i, decus, i, nostrum; melioribus utere fatis.'
> tantum effatus, et in uerbo uestigia torsit.
>
> (*A*. 6.546-47)
>
> 'Go, our renown, go; experience better fates.'
> So much he said and as he spoke turned on his heel.

An injunction to go forth to the future, where the glory of Troy and of the past (*decus nostrum*, 546) now lies, and to experience a fate better than that which the past had to offer is what Deiphobus delivers to his Trojan comrade-in-arms, as he turns his back upon him.

---

and B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964) 306ff. But see W.A. Camps, 'The Role of the Sixth Book in the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 7 (1967-68) 26ff.

[3] Though of course this is not the only level. For a discussion of the significance of the Aeneas-Dido liaison in Book 4 for the evaluation of Aeneas' mission see pp. 115-20 above.

Deiphobus' final words conclude Aeneas' confrontation with his past, and, in so doing, bring to a dramatic head certain questions which have been forming themselves in the reader's mind throughout the Palinurus, Dido and Deiphobus encounters: Will Aeneas turn his back upon the past as the past turns its back upon him? Will he be born anew and emerge from the underworld as the paradigmatic embodiment of *decus* and *pietas*, leaving behind his old self and his old *furor* in the oblivion of the irrevocable past, and so perhaps justify the tragedy and loss which has accompanied his progress towards empire — the tragedy and loss, of which the encounters with Palinurus, Dido and Deiphobus (with their emphasis upon suffering, anguish, emptiness and injustice — see esp. *A.* 6.363-71, 475-76, 494-97) serve as a compressed restatement?[4] The potent *decus nostrum* ('our renown', *A.* 6.546), which places Aeneas and the glory he will seek to achieve on a line of firm continuity with his Trojan past, augurs ill for the answers to these questions.

The confrontation with the past in the darkness of Hades gives way (albeit not immediately) to the revelation of the future in the light of Elysium (*A.* 6.756ff.),[5] when the *meliora fata* so earnestly wished for Aeneas by his Trojan comrade (*A.* 6.546) are shown to him in apocalyptic splendour by his father, Anchises, who conducts his son through the glorious history of his descendants and informs him of his 'destiny' (*tua fata*, *A.* 6.759). And 'destiny' includes not merely events and persons, but philosophy, ideology, mode of action and of existence:

excudent alii spirantia mollius aera
(credo equidem), uiuos ducent de marmore uultus,
orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent;
tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,[6]
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

(*A.* 6.847-53)

Others more delicately will sculpt breathing bronze
(I do not doubt), will draw living faces from marble,
Will orate causes better, or mark with rod
The heaven's movements and tell the rising stars;

[4] For affirmative answers to these questions see Warde Fowler [2] 419ff., Otis [2] 290ff. and 'Three Problems of *Aeneid* 6', *TAPA* 90 (1959) 166-70, and W. S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1969) 58. Camps [2] 28 adopts the unusual position of denying that 'the experience of Book 6 is conceived by the poet as having any effect at all upon his character'.

[5] Although the light-dark antithesis between Elysium and Hades has been generally over-estimated by the commentators — see, e.g., Anderson [4] 58-59.

[6] On *pacique imponere morem* see R. D. Williams, 'The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*', *G&R* n.s. 11 (1964) 61-62, who discusses succinctly and well both the meaning of the phrase and the correctness of the reading.

You, Roman, remember to rule nations with your command —
These will be your arts — to stamp peace with men's practice,
To spare the humbled and to crush the proud in war.

This series of forceful moral imperatives, which brings to a climax the vision of Rome's future majesty and greatness (the climactic nature of Anchises' injunction is reinforced by the description of its effect upon Aeneas and the Sibyl — *mirantibus*, 'marvelling', *A.* 6.854), constitutes both the first and the only fully overt declaration to Aeneas of the *raison d'être* of his mission, the ideology of the imperial process.[7] Recalling the *Georgics*' concluding picture of 'victorious' Caesar 'thundering in war by deep Euphrates and giving justice among willing nations' (*G.* 4.560-62), *pacique imponere morem/parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* is the *Aeneid*'s most precise articulation of the ideology of empire.[8] It contains specific directives on the manner in which *pietas* is to be manifested in the practice of empire — directives in fact which point with sharpness and clarity to the road which Aeneas must follow if he is to become the reborn man of *pietas* and achieve that spiritual regeneration which the justification of his mission demands. The question which was in the reader's mind in the earlier part of the underworld scene — Will Aeneas emerge as the paradigm of *pietas* and so perhaps justify the suffering and the loss which his pursuit of empire has entailed? — now reformulates itself into one of the most pervasive questions of the *Aeneid*: Will the ideology of empire be made reality and so perhaps justify the tragedy which the attempt to realise it involves?[9]

In Book 6 itself Virgil answers this question quite clearly; and his answer occurs significantly at the beginning and the end of the book. The earlier passage first. After landing in Italy Aeneas' initial action is to make for the temple of Apollo (*A.* 6.9-13), upon the doors of which he contemplates a series of pictures engraved by the Cretan craftsman, Daedalus (*A.* 6.14-33).

---

[7] By Book 8 the less overt ideological declaration of the shield is all that the Romanised Aeneas requires to maintain and confirm him in his mission. For a recent attempt to dissociate Aeneas from Anchises' declaration here, see G. Williams, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven and London 1983) 148 f. and 208 f., strongly criticised by M. C. J. Putnam, *AJP* 105 (1984) 228-31.

[8] For the relationship of this ideology to contemporary political postures see *Res Gestae*, 3:

> bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum suscepi uictorque omnibus superstitibus ciuibus peperci. externas gentes quibus tuto ignosci potuit, conseruare quam excidere malui.

> Wars civil and foreign, on land and on sea, throughout the whole world I undertook, and, victorious, spared all citizens who survived. The foreign tribes who could be pardoned with safety, I preferred to keep in existence rather than extinguish.

Signally the four virtues commemorated on the golden shield presented to Augustus in 28/27 B.C. by the Senate and People of Rome were: *uirtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas* (*Res Gestae* 34).

[9] Answered in the affirmative by B. Otis, 'Virgil and Clio', *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 59-75, who maintains that Virgil regarded Roman *imperium* as justified by 'its civilizing, peace-giving mission: *pacis imponere morem*. The Iliadic *Aeneid* illustrates the *humanitas*, the rejection of violence, which the great moral of the "Show of Heroes" implicitly demanded' (69).

Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna
praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo
insuetum per iter gelidas enauit ad Arctos,
Chalcidicaque leuis tandem super astitit arce.
redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacrauit
remigium alarum posuitque immania templa.
in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas
Cecropidae iussi (miserum!) septena quotannis
corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna.
contra elata mari respondet Cnosia tellus:
hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto
Pasiphae mixtumque genus prolesque biformis
Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae,
hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error;
magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem
Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit,
caeca regens filo uestigia.

(*A.*6.14-30)

Daedalus (the tale is told) in flight from Minos' realm,
Daring to entrust himself to sky on swift wings,
Floated by a strange route to the frozen North
And came gently to rest at last on Chalcidian heights.
First restored here to earth he dedicated to you,
Phoebus, his wings' oarage and built a huge temple.
On the doors Androgeos' death; next the Cecropidae
Ordered to make payment — pitiful! — with seven bodies
Each year of their sons; there stands the urn, the lots drawn.
Facing, rising from the sea, is the Cnossian land:
Here the bull's cruel love and Pasiphae
Mated by stealth and that mongrel breed and biformed issue
Minotaur, a reminder of sinful love.
Here that house of toil and inextricable wandering;
But in fact pitying the princess' deep love,
Daedalus himself unwound the building's wiles and maze,
Guiding blind steps with thread.

The pictures consist of four panels (clearly signposted by *in foribus* ... *tum* ... *contra* ... *hic* ... *hic*, 'on the doors ... next ... facing ... here ... here', 20-27): 1. The death of Minos' son, Androgeos (20); 2. The yearly tribute of seven youths exacted from the Athenians (20-22); 3. Pasiphae's love for the bull, and the off-spring of their union, the Minotaur (24-26); 4. Theseus and the labyrinth (27-30). The relevance of these pictures has sometimes been questioned,[10] but it seems reasonably certain that one of their functions is to

[10] As, e.g., by H.W. Prescott, *The Development of Virgil's Art* (Chicago 1927) 266: 'The description halts the action, or, rather, fills an interval of time in the action, without itself contributing to the action in any way'.

represent symbolically Aeneas' recent past and, in the case of the final panel, his imminent future.[11]

The first two panels are described in only three lines; and their relevance to Aeneas' own experience is of a somewhat general (but nonetheless important) nature. The themes of these two panels — death, suffering and sacrifice — have such numerous experiential correlates in Aeneas' recent past (Creusa, Anchises, Dido and Palinurus are the most conspicuous examples) that, even though the correlation is not of a precise or specific sort, the pictures themselves take on the function of a symbolic, if blurred, looking-glass, in which Aeneas can view the tragic cost of his pursuit of destiny and empire. Nor should the absence of precise parallelism here affect the reader's response; for sufficient indication that a correlation between the motifs of the pictures and the Trojan hero's experience is intended is provided by the emphasis thrown upon the name *Androgeo* (20); for Androgeos was also the name of the first Greek to be slain by Aeneas and his fellow-warriors in Book 2 (*A.* 2.370ff).

In the third panel the correlation becomes far more specific. Pasiphae's cruel infatuation (*crudelis amor*, 24) for the bull seems obviously designed to mirror the Dido-Aeneas liaison, of which cruelty was a central characteristic. It is not without reason that Aeneas is called *crudelis* by Dido at *A.* 4.311 and 661 (the latter is Dido's final description of Aeneas), that the death for which the Carthaginian queen is destined is said to be a cruel one (*crudeli funere*, *A.* 4.308), and that, like Pasiphae (*A.* 6.447), she finds herself among those whom harsh love (*durus amor*) has consumed with cruel wasting (*crudeli tabe*, *A.* 6.442). Parallelism can also be seen between Pasiphae's deceitful mating (*supposta furto*, 24) and Dido's initial secret love (*furtiuum amorem*, *A.* 4.171), and between the hopelessness of Pasiphae's love for a creature on a different ontological level from herself and the corresponding hopelessness of Dido's love for Aeneas; and Pasiphae, like Dido, was a victim of Venus. As for *Veneris monimenta nefandae* (26), it may be the case that Aeneas did not leave behind him a monstrous off-spring of his union with Dido, but he did bequeath to the Carthaginian queen 'reminders of sinful love' both figurative and literal (with *Veneris monimenta nefandae*, *A.* 6.26, *cf. nefandi cuncta uiri monimenta*, 'all reminders of the sinful wretch', *A.* 4.497-98). Indeed it is with one of the *nefandi uiri monimenta* — the sword which she had obtained as a gift for her lover (*A.* 4.646-47) — that Dido brings her life to a tragic end.

---

[11] *Cf.* Otis [2] 284-85, C.P. Segal, '*Aeternum per saecula nomen*, The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part I', *Arion* 4 (1965) 643ff., and Anderson [4] 55-56. The objection of D. E. Eichholz, 'Symbol and Contrast in the *Aeneid*', *G&R* n.s. 16 (1969) 110-11, that the reliefs cannot be a symbol of Aeneas' past because 'Aeneas is not moved by them', can hardly be thought to be strong. It assumes falsely that a character's failure to recognise something as a symbol of his experience entails that the poet does not intend the *reader* to construe it as such. Nor is it at all clear that 'Aeneas is not moved' by the reliefs; *miserum* ('pitiful!', *A.* 6.21) seems to suggest that he is.

The fourth panel serves a Janus-function. It looks back to Aeneas' labyrinthine wanderings prior to his arrival at Cumae (*cf. caecis erramus in undis*, 'we wander amid the blind waters', *A.* 3.200, with the *caeca uestigia*, 'blind steps', *A.* 6.30, of Theseus), to his affair with Dido (the parallels between the Theseus-Ariadne relationship and Aeneas' liaison with Dido are too obvious to merit enumeration)[12] and to the Trojan Games of Book 5 (see esp. *A.* 5.588-91), themselves reminders of Dido (see esp. *A.* 5. esp. 5.571f.); it looks forward to the Trojan's hard journey (*iter durum*, *A.* 6.688) into Hades[13] — a journey which, like Theseus' penetration of the Cretan labyrinth, will require its own talisman for success. In Aeneas' case, however, the talisman is to be no simple ball of thread (*filo*, 30), but the shifting, sinister, complexly symbolic bough of gold.

The thematic relevance of the sculptured panels is underlined by a number of close affinities between Aeneas and Daedalus.[14] Both Aeneas and Daedalus are mature men with grown sons. Both are exiles in search of a new home. Both are devotees of Apollo — Daedalus dedicated his oars to Apollo and erected a temple to him (18-19); Aeneas dedicated a shield to Apollo (*A.* 3.286-88) and is to promise a temple for the future (*A.* 6.69-70). Both display depth and fullness of emotional response towards human suffering (*cf.* Daedalus' pity for Ariadne — *miseratus*, 'pitying', 28 — with Aeneas' pity for Dido — *miseratur*, 'pities', *A.* 6.476; and note that *miserum*, 'pitiful!', 21, is presumably intended to reflect the sympathy of both craftsman and spectator). The specificity and precision of the above resemblances render a non-functional approach to the Daedalus reliefs untenable.

The pictures on the temple doors have been discussed at some length in order to provide a context in which the significance of the final lines of this section (*A.* 6.30-33) can be understood and their relevance to the ideology-actuality issue comprehended. For Virgil is taking great pains here to establish an analogy which has dynamic repercussions throughout the rest of the poem — the analogy of the failure of the artist.[15] At *A.* 6.30-33 Virgil concludes his description of the Daedalus engravings with these lines:

---

[12] Indeed there are close echoes in Virgil's account of Dido in Book 4 of Catullus' portrait of Ariadne in *Carmen* 64. For a bibliography on this question see Anderson [4] 115 n. 8.

[13] For the association of the labyrinth with the underworld see W. F. Jackson Knight's famous study, *Cumaean Gates* (Oxford 1936). *Cf.* also F. Fletcher's edition, *Virgil Aeneid VI* (Oxford 1941) *ad loc.* and P. J. Enk, 'De labyrinthi imagine in foribus templi Cumani insculpta (Vergilii Aen. VI 27)', *Mnemosyne* (ser. 4) 11 (1958) 322-30.

[14] *Cf.* V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils*² (Vienna 1964) 258-60 (149-50 in G. Seligson's translation of the first edition, *The Art of Vergil*, Ann Arbor 1962), Segal [11] 643-45, and Anderson [4] 55-56. Eichholz [11] 111 surprisingly contends that the similarity between Daedalus and Aeneas is restricted to their both being exiles.

[15] Contrast J. W. Zarker, 'Aeneas and Theseus in *Aeneid* 6', *CJ* 62 (1967) 221: 'Daedalus, however, has no apparent relationship either to the rest of Book 6 or to the *Aeneid* as a whole'.

tu quoque magnam
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,
bis patriae cecidere manus.

(*A*. 6.30-33)

You too would have prominent
Place in the great work, if grief allowed, Icarus.
Twice he had tried to fashion the fall in gold;
Twice a father's hands failed.

The affinities between Aeneas and Daedalus (reinforced by verbal parallellism — *pater* used of Aeneas at *A*. 5.867, *patriae* of Daedalus at *A*. 6.33 — and by the sea imagery defining Daedalus' journey: *enauit*, 'floated', 'swam', *A*. 6.16; *remigium alarum*, 'his wings' oarage', *A*. 6.19) strongly suggest that Daedalus' failure portends the prospective failure of Aeneas.[16] And by failure is meant not merely the Trojan's frustrated attempts to embrace the shade of his father, Anchises, when he encounters him in Elysium (*A*. 6.700-01), although *A*. 6.32-33 do foreshadow that experience — just as they recall another of Aeneas' bitter moments of anguish: the loss of his wife, Creusa, in Book 2 (*A*. 2.792-93). The failure of the Cretan craftsman and the prospective failure of the Trojan hero have more things in common than the private suffering associated with deep, personal loss. There are larger things at issue here. Daedalus tried to compensate for the loss of his dearest possession, Icarus, by bestowing upon him the deathlessness and eternity of embodiment in a work of art; but his attempt to realise in gold (*in auro*, 32) the image of his son is frustrated, and the achievement designed to offset the loss for which he was responsible fails to actualise. The implications of this both for Aeneas' past and his imminent future (and the foreshadowing of the *catabasis* by the labyrinth image of *A*. 6.27 indicates that Aeneas' future is concerned here) are patent. Loss, suffering and sacrifice — mostly, like Daedalus' loss of Icarus, of a profoundly personal nature — have followed in the wake of Aeneas' tragic progress towards empire. The juxtaposition of the symbolic representation of this loss with the craftsman's marked failure to create and to compensate clearly intimates that Aeneas' attempt to offset the loss for which he is responsible (or at least to a very large extent responsible), that is to say, his endeavour to actualise the very thing which might to some extent counterbalance the tragic consequences of his mission, will, like Daedalus' own abortive essay in indemnificatory achievement, end in frustration and failure. The imperial

---

Zarker's own thesis that 'On these panels Vergil would seem to be presenting to Aeneas and his companions in the person of Theseus an example for admiration and emulation' (222) is totally at odds with the sorts of detail the poet chooses to emphasise.

[16] *Cf.* M. C. J. Putnam, '*Aeneid* 7 and the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 91 (1970) 429, who also observes this.

imago articulated by Jupiter in Book 1, by Anchises in Book 6, later — engraven on the shield of Book 8 (*imagine*, *A.* 8.730) — to be carried by Aeneas into battle, the *imago* which, if actualised, might constitute the achievement capable of compensating for, even of justifying, the loss entailed by empire's progress, will remain as unrealised in history (*rerum*, *A.* 8.730) as Icarus' image was unrealised in gold.

Nor does the import of this crucial analogy stop here. It is an indication of the thoroughness with which Virgil pursued this analogy (and hence of its thematic importance) that the Cretan sculptor and the Trojan hero are kept from achievement by *dolor* (and *dolor*, 'grief', arising from the deaths of youths in their charge — *cf.A.* 6.31 with *A.* 12.945) and that the failures of both of them are linked with one of the most deceptive of natural substances — gold. It is not without purpose that Virgil points to the golden nature of the temple at Cumae (*aurea*, *A.* 6.13) and then subtly associates this 'goldenness' with failure, death, and non-fulfilment (*in auro*, *A.* 6.32); for the golden bough (*A.* 6.136ff. and 201ff.), the golden promises of history (*aurea saecula*, 'golden ages', *A.* 6.793ff., *A.* 8.324ff.), and the golden shield made by Vulcan (*A.* 8.625ff.)[17] lead not to ideological triumph and glory but to frustration and tragic death, when the studs on the golden belt of Pallas (*auro*, *A.* 10.499) blind Aeneas to all thoughts of *humanitas* and of pity (*A.* 12.941ff.). The dire connection of gold with suffering, death and failure, of which Aeneas has often been the witness (e.g. *A.* 1.348ff., *A.* 3.56ff.), will simply repeat itself in his own experience.

The last point is singularly important and, although it will be discussed more fully below, deserves brief comment here. For it will be precisely this inability to extricate himself from the past which more than anything else will render Aeneas' attempt to realise the ideology which his future requires vain and ineffective.[18] Like Daedalus' own endeavour, Aeneas' struggle to forge something permanent and eternal will result in the recreation of the suffering, guilt and cruelty of the past. Death will lead to sacrifice and retribution in Aeneas' own case as surely and inevitably as it does in the *exemplum* from Cretan history; and, as in the *exemplum* from Cretan history (*Androgeo* ... *natorum*, *A.* 6.20-22), the death and the sacrifice concerned will devolve primarily upon the young.[19] As he stands in front of the temple doors at

---

[17] See n. 71 below.

[18] Contrast Segal [11] 644: 'Yet here appears the major difference between Daedalus and Aeneas: Aeneas *does* leave the past behind'.

[19] Most important here of course are the *iuuenes* 'sacrificed' by Aeneas (see esp. *immolet* *A.* 10.519, *immolat*, *A.* 10.541, *A.* 12.949) in 'retribution' (cf. *poenas*, *A.* 6.20 with *poenam*, *A.* 12.949) for the death of the *iuuenis/puer*, Pallas. It is to be noted however that these particular immolations are but an instance of one of the most prominent themes of the battle-books of the *Aeneid* — the loss incurred by the sacrifice of the young. See pp. 120-24.

Cumae, Aeneas is confronted once more (*cf.* the frescoes on Dido's temple in Book 1)[20] with an image of himself.

Thus the sixth *Aeneid* begins. It ends (apart from three lines of concluding narrative) as follows:

sunt geminae somni portae, quarum altera fertur
cornea, qua ueris facilis datur exitus umbris,
altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes:
his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna.

(*A.* 6.893-98)

There are twin gates of sleep, one of them, it's said,
Of horn, through which true shades are given easy exit;
The other glittering is fashioned of shining ivory,
But through it Spirits send false dreams to the upper world.
Here then with these words Anchises escorts his son
And the Sybil and sends them through the gate of ivory.

Despite the enormous amount of controversy and hyper-ingenious guess-work which this passage has caused,[21] its import is plain. Indeed so obvious is the meaning of Aeneas' meticulously delineated exit from the underworld that Servius himself (not, as is well known, the most sensitive of literary critics)[22] was forced to write:

vult autem intelligi falsa esse omnia quae dixit.

(*ad A.* 6.893)

---

[20] See p. 103.

[21] A useful summary and discussion of some of the main lines of interpretation up until 1959 can be found in Otis [4] 173 ff. Otis' own interpretation that Aeneas' 'Hades vision is a dream and a "false dream" in the sense that it is not to be taken as literal reality' (176) invites as little acceptance as the views which he criticises. *Falsa* can hardly mean 'symbolically true', as Otis wishes to contend. For a similar view to that of Otis see Williams [6] 62. Other noted writers on the subject include C. P. Segal, '*Aeternum per saecula nomen*, The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part II', *Arion* 5 (1966) 62-66, whose theory of the 'different orders of reality', viz. 'awareness and action', fails to account for the force of *falsa* and the semantic repercussions of the allusion to Homer, and Anderson [4] 61-62, whose observation, 'Whatever he meant, Vergil definitely sets us thinking' (62), can scarcely be considered helpful — *cf.* the analogous 'unhelpfulness' of W. Clausen, 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 68 (1964) 147: 'I have a sense, which I cannot quite put into words, that Virgil was not merely telling the time of night' (reprinted in S. Commager [ed.], Virgil [Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1966] 88). Similarly disappointing is the recent discussion of Williams [7] 46-58, whose conclusion — 'it is suggested that our knowledge of what happened to Aeneas in the Underworld is analogous to a deceptive dream' in the sense of one that 'needs interpretation' (p. 57) — ignores (*inter alia*) crucial details of the Homeric 'model'. More reasonable attempts at the passage are those of J. J. Bray, 'The Ivory Gate', in M. Kelly (ed.), *For Service to Classical Studies: Essays in Honour of Francis Letters* (Melbourne 1966) 55-69, and Putnam [16] 428-29, esp. n. 35.

[22] The limitations of Servius as a commentator are well discussed by R. D. Williams, 'Servius-Commentator and Guide', *PVS* 6 (1966-67) 50-60.

He [Virgil] intends all that he has said to be understood as false.

— even though such a statement ought to have entailed on Servius' part a serious rethinking of his own interpretation of the poem's purpose. Not that one has to accept Servius' comment *in toto* (either on this passage or on any other); for the undiscerning nature of his *omnia* ('all') can be shown by a close scrutiny of the text. But at least it is to the early commentator's credit that, unlike many of his modern successors, he did not allow his own *idée fixe* about the *Aeneid* to blind him to the transparent meaning of this crucial section of the poem.

The reader has of course encountered false or empty dreams earlier in Book 6 — at the entrance to Hades, where an old elm-tree inhabited by *somnia vana*, 'empty dreams', is rooted (*A*. 6.282-84). But if the import of that passage may be thought to be unclear, that of the *falsa insomnia* episode, which it foreshadows (false dreams at the entrance, false dreams at the exit) and reinforces, cannot. For in this latter passage Virgil eschews ambiguity and opacity of meaning, purposefully combining clarity and specificity of Homeric allusion with detailed (indeed, almost heavy-handed) application of the allusion to one of the crucial events of Book 6 — Anchises' indoctrination of Aeneas. The result is one of the most unequivocal passages in the *Aeneid*.

This is the *Odyssey* passage upon which the Virgilian text is based:

δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμενηνῶν εἰσὶν ὀνείρων·
αἱ μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχαται, αἱ δ' ἐλέφαντι·
τῶν οἳ μέν κ' ἔλθωσι διὰ πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος,
οἵ ῥ' ἐλεφαίρονται, ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες·
οἳ δὲ διὰ ξεστῶν κεράων ἔλθωσι θύραζε,
οἵ ῥ' ἔτυμα κραίνουσι, βροτῶν ὅτε κέν τις ἴδηται.

(*Od*. 19.562-67)

There are two gates of insubstantial dreams.
One pair is fashioned of horn, the other of ivory.
Of dreams those that pass through carven ivory
Deceive, bearing words with no fulfilment;
But those that pass to the outside world through polished horn
Fulfil true things, when any mortal sees them.

There can be no doubt that in the *Odyssey* passage the dreams which pass through the ivory gate are dream-figures (ὄνειρος nearly always means dream-figure in Homer, not dream-experience)[23] and dream-figures which deceive, which bear 'words with no fulfilment'. Indeed the latter point is emphasised in Homer by a pun on ἐλέφας ('ivory') and ἐλεφαίρομαι ('I cheat or deceive with false hopes'). Similarly there can be no doubt that in the *Aeneid* episode which alludes to this passage the dream-figures, the *falsa insomnia (insomnia* =

[23] See E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951) 104.

Greek ἐνύπνια, a more precise term for dream-figures than ὄνειροι),[24] sent through the ivory gate are, as the word *falsa* itself indicates, delusive, non-veridical; they carry words, promises, hopes which remain unrealised, which fail to correspond to the actualities of experience. Any alternative interpretation of the phrase *falsa insomnia* would involve as a concomitant proposition that Virgil misused both the Latin language and the Homeric tradition with the deliberate intention of misleading his readers. It seems preferable to think that semantic obfuscation was not a Virgilian goal.

The Homeric model then clearly demonstrates that by *falsa* Virgil intends to mean what the Latin word actually does mean, viz. 'false'.[25] But it is not only the meaning of the expression, *falsa insomnia*, which is unambiguous; for through the poet's explicit application of the Homeric allusion to Aeneas and to Anchises' words to him, its reference and thematic function become transparent. Anchises has been by far the dominant partner in the apocalypse scene ever since its commencement (*A.* 6.679ff.). He has lectured Aeneas on the ultimate mysteries of the universe (*A.* 6.724-51), conducted him through a parade of future Roman heroes (*A.* 6.756-846, 855ff.), and delivered to him the ideology of his mission (*A.* 6.847-53). Aeneas' conduct throughout the indoctrination has been essentially passive, and just before he leaves the underworld Anchises is seen once more to be working on him — going over the details with him (*A.* 6.888), inflaming his heart with love of future fame (*A.* 6.889), informing him of the wars to be waged, the peoples to be faced, the toils to be avoided or endured (*A.* 6.890-92). The reader is now confronted with the *somni portae* passage (*A.* 6.893-96) — in which he is told *not* that the ivory gate is one through which *falsa insomnia* rise up to earth, but rather one through which the *Manes* 'send' (*mittunt*, *A.* 6.896) *falsa insomnia* to the world above. The focus then immediately returns to Anchises' instructions to Aeneas (*A.* 6.897-98), as the poet narrates how 'with these words' (*his* ... *dictis*, *A.* 6.897-98) Anchises — himself one of the *Manes* — 'sends' (*emittit*, *A.* 6.898; *cf. mittunt*, *A.* 6.896) his son and the Sibyl out through the ivory gate.

Virgil could not have been less opaque. Aeneas and the Sibyl are *falsa insomnia*, dream-figures 'bearing words with no fulfilment' (*Od.* 19.565). The instructions with which Anchises sends them out through the ivory gate (and note the emphasis which these 'words' receive through the separation of *his*, *A.* 6.897, from *dictis*, *A.* 6.898, and how *eburna*, 'of ivory', is left to the end of

---

[24] *Cf.* Servius' definition of *insomnium*, viz. *quod uidemus in somnis* ('what we see in our sleep', *ad A.* 5.840). The only other occurrence of *insomnia* in Virgil is at *A.* 4.9, apparently in reference to the infatuated Dido's visions of Aeneas. See also R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford 1977) *ad loc.*

[25] If I seem to be labouring the obvious, it is because the obvious has been almost universally ignored.

the line for impact), the father's momentous *dicta* to his son, will prove but the ἔπε' ἀκράαντα of a non-veridical dream. The ultimate mysteries of existence as expounded to Aeneas, the glory of his future and the ideology of his task will, like the words carried by the other *falsa insomnia* sent by the *Manes* to earth, find little verification in experience. They may take root in the mind of man and be the driving force for action; but to Virgil at least it is clear that to believe, as Anchises is made to declare at *A.* 6.724ff., that the universe which man inhabits 'is nourished by a spirit within' (*spiritus intus alit, A.* 6.726), that 'mind permeates its parts and drives the whole of the universe's mass' (*totamque infusa per artus/mens agitat molem, A.* 6.726-27), to believe in fact that the world of man is rational and ordered and that human beings are so constituted that the ideology of empire can be made reality and the glorious process of history assured is to dream, and to dream falsely at that.

So much is manifest. But what is perhaps not so apparent is the subtle and potent effect of the imagery of the *somni portae* passage. Concerning *geminae* ('twin', *A.* 6.893) and its association with the serpent, destruction and *furor*, something has been said in the preceding chapter.[26] But notice also the images of brightness and gleam (*candenti ... nitens*, 'shining', 'glittering', *A.* 6.895) — images not present in the Homeric model (unless one counts ξεστῶν, 'polished', *Od.* 19.566, applied to the gate of horn) — which Virgil specifically chooses for his description of the ivory gate. One of the effects of these images is to recall the brightness and refulgence connected with the glorious promises of history earlier in Book 6 — the shining fields of the parade of heroes (*campos nitentis, A.* 6.677), the gleam of the golden bough amid the branches (*refulsit, A.* 6.204; *cf. A.* 1.402, 588, *A.* 2.590, *A.* 8.623); while another is to foreshadow the continuation of this association in the later books of the *Aeneid*, especially the ideological eighth book — the gleaming sow (*candida sus, A.* 8.82-83) which presages the founding of glorious Alba (*clari cognominis Albam, A.* 8.48), the brightness of Venus (*candida, A.* 8.608) who brings the arms upon which Rome's future is emblazoned, the refulgence of the arms themselves (*refulget, A.* 8.623; *cf. A.* 6.204), and the brilliance of the Augustan triumph at Actium, mirrored in the dazzling waves around Leucate (*effulgere, A.* 8.677), in the shining helmet of the victorious Agrippa (*fulgent, A.* 8.684), and in the resplendent temple of Apollo (*candentis Phoebi, A.* 8.720), upon the threshold of which Augustus sits, surveying the peoples he has conquered. It is of course fitting that imagery associated with the renown and glory vouchsafed by the future should surround Aeneas' departure from the underworld. But by linking this imagery with the notions of deception and falsity which the ivory gate represents, Virgil forcefully suggests that the gleam and splendid radiance

---

[26] See p. 106 n. 41.

of the promises which history makes to the individual are illusory and deceptive. As the gold of the Daedalus reliefs served as a precursorial symbol of disaster and failure, so the bright and lustrous sheen of the gate of *falsa insomnia* is but a harbinger of tragedy, death, and the non-fulfilment of empire's dream. It is one of the appropriate ironies of the *Aeneid* that the gleam with which the poem ends comes not from the radiance of empire's vision but from the captured belt of Pallas, as its well-known studs dazzle the moral sensibility of the Trojan hero (*notis fulserunt cingula bullis*, 'the belt flashed forth with its well-known studs', *A*. 12.942) and generate in him the *furor* which negates the ideological reverie of Book 6 and exposes the corruptive, ruinous and mendacious splendour of empire's promises.[27]

Ideology and Distraction

There can be little doubt that one of the major reasons for the failure of the ideology of empire is its naivety. The view of history and empire which it presents is patently at odds with the realities of experience, and its simplistic assumptions and antitheses (*pietas/furor*, *subiecti/superbi*) and the moral program to which they give rise reflect this. In the passive experience of an apocalypse the brightness of the ideology may temporarily overwhelm (*cf. mirantibus*, 'marvelling', *A*. 6.854); but when juxtaposed with the tragic cost of the historical mission which it advocates, that is to say, when placed against the plethora of individual suffering and loss which the attempt to realise it involves, the brightness of its promises grows dim. Failure to take adequate cognisance of the claims of the individual in history is both source of the illusory splendour of empire's ideology and, ultimately and inevitably, source of its non-fulfilment.

This neglect endemic to the imperial ideology of the human wastage generated by the mission it inspires is a theme which dominates the sixth *Aeneid*. Signally it is Aeneas and not the ideological spokesman, Anchises, who at *A*. 6.860ff. draws attention to the young Marcellus, Augustus' nephew, son-in-law and heir, who died in 23 B.C. at the premature age of 19:

> atque hic Aeneas (una namque ire uidebat
> egregium forma iuuenem et fulgentibus armis,
> sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina uultu):
> 'quis, pater, ille, uirum qui sic comitatur euntem?
> filius, anne aliquis magna de stirpe nepotum?

[27] *Cf.* the disastrous gleam from the helmet of Messapus (*refulsit*, 'flashed back', *A*. 9.374) which leads to the deaths of Euryalus and Nisus — the helmet's brilliance is again referred to at the end of the episode (*nitentem*, 'shining', *A*. 9.457). And note also the death-serpent-gleam association in the description of the murderous Pyrrhus in Book 2 (*coruscus*, 'gleaming', *A*. 2.470; *nitidus*, 'shining', *A*. 2.473; *micat*, 'flashes', *A*. 2.475).

qui strepitus circa comitum! quantum instar in ipso!
sed nox atra caput tristi circumuolat umbra.'

(*A.* 6.860-66)

Just then Aeneas (for he saw walking with him
A young man of singular beauty in gleaming arms,
Yet his brow held little joy, his eyes and face downcast):
'Who is that, father, who accompanies the hero on his way?
His son? Or one of the great line of his descendants?
What a roar from the comrades round him! What greatness in himself!
Yet black night flits round his head with melancholy shade.'

Marcellus is a *iuuenis* (861) — his youth is emphasised throughout this episode (*cf. puer*, 'boy', *A.* 6.875 and *A.* 6.882) — and as such represents in its sharpest, most poignant form the human loss against which the proclaimed splendour of the historical mission (imagistically suggested by the brightness of the young man's armour — *fulgentibus armis*, 861) is to be weighed. The prolonged allusion to his death at the end of Book 6 takes up the reference to the death of Icarus and the sacrifice of the *nati* ('sons', *A.* 6.22) with which the book commenced,[28] the tragic wastage involved in the loss of all these *iuuenes* serving to anticipate and to reinforce Virgil's emphasis in the second half of the *Aeneid* upon empire's immolation of the young.[29] Aeneas' alertness to the tragic figure of the young Marcellus is therefore of no small importance. The same holds for Anchises' reply:

o nate, ingentem luctum ne quaere tuorum.

(*A.* 6.868)

My son, do not inquire into the vast sorrow of your kin.

Why does Anchises not want Aeneas to inquire into the vast sorrow of his kin? Why does Anchises seek to distract Aeneas from the contemplation of individual human suffering and loss? Does he fear, perhaps, that too much reflection upon human tragedy will cloud the imperial vision?[30]

But Anchises is by no means the first to attempt to distract Aeneas. To return to the beginning of Book 6. Aeneas' first action in the book, as observed above, is to visit the temple of Apollo, upon the doors of which he witnesses a saga of individual suffering and tragedy, of death, sacrifice, cruelty and failure, germane to his own experience. But it is a saga which he is not allowed to examine at length, for, while they are gazing at the pictures, Aeneas and his companions are interrupted by the Sibyl with the injunction:

---

[28] The parallelism between the deaths of Marcellus and Icarus is well noted by Segal [21] 55-56.

[29] See pp. 120-24.

[30] *Cf.* Segal [21] 63: 'The founder of a new city and eventually of an empire should not think too much of the individual dissolution that, in one sense, negates all human endeavor'. Segal however fails to connect this observation with the theme of distraction in the sixth *Aeneid*.

non hoc ista sibi tempus spectacula poscit.

(*A.* 6.37)

It is not those sights that this moment demands.

This blunt, cold, impersonal statement reflects not only the impersonal nature of the call of history but also the tenuous fabric of history's ideology. Aeneas has to be distracted from contemplating scenes of individual suffering and individual tragedy, if he is to become the man of empire and the champion of her ideology; for the simplistic dictates of empire demand on the part of empire's ministers an obliviousness, indeed a behavioural abnegation, of the claims of the individual in history.

This distraction theme is one which recurs at important junctures in Book 6. Again and again Aeneas is interrupted by the Sibyl and prevented from examining and reflecting upon the individual suffering and nullification which he encounters — in particular, the individual suffering and nullification generated by the pursuit of empire and of glory. In the interviews with Palinurus (see esp. *A.* 6.372ff.) and Deiphobus Aeneas is simply not given time to think. Note especially the way in which the Deiphobus colloquy is brought to a close:

et fors omne datum traherent per talia tempus,
sed comes admonuit breuiterque adfata Sibylla est:
'nox ruit, Aenea; nos flendo ducimus horas.'

(*A.* 6.537-39)

And they might have spent all the allotted time in such talk,
But his companion the Sibyl addressed him curtly and warned:
'Night rushes on, Aeneas; we waste the hours weeping.'

Aeneas' desire to spend more time in thoughtful converse with his suffering friend, like his wish to prolong his contemplation of the scenes on the doors of Apollo's temple (*cf.* *A.* 6.33-34 with 537), is impeded by the Sibyl.[31] Tears shed for individual tragedy, like reflection upon scenes of human suffering, ill accord with the impersonal demands of empire. Indeed by the time the Sibyl and the Trojan hero reach Tartarus, Aeneas is no longer allowed to witness suffering at first-hand; it is conveyed to him through the distancing and distorting medium of a moralistic sermon (*A.* 6.562-627).[32] Nor should one

[31] Segal's contention [21] 39 that at the conclusion of the Deiphobus scene Aeneas feels 'the pressure of his purpose' seems to have little support in the text. Aeneas has virtually to be dragged away by the Sibyl. This is realised by Otis [2] 296, who squares this incident with his own interpretation of *Aeneid* 6 by construing the colloquy with Deiphobus as 'idle reminiscence'!

[32] The popular view — see Otis [4] 168, [2] 297-98, and Segal [21] 40-41 — that the Tartarus section of Book 6 illustrates the basic moral structure of the world ignores (*inter alia*) the following two points: 1. The basic morality of Tartarus is conveyed to Aeneas second-hand — he is not

forget that at the conclusion of this sermon, before Aeneas has the opportunity to ask any probing questions, the Sibyl adds the injunction:

> sed iam age, carpe uiam et susceptum perfice munus;
> acceleremus.
>
> (*A.* 6.629-30)
>
> But come now, get on your way and finish the task in hand.
> Let us speed.

Three imperatives, followed by a iussive subjunctive. Why the urgency? Is the Sibyl perhaps not a little afraid that the crystalline structure of empire's ideology will shatter under the impact of careful thought?

The colloquy of Aeneas and Palinurus at *A.* 6.341ff. is important in this context. It is clear in that passage that Apollo is guilty of deceiving Aeneas by withholding information (his prophecy is fulfilled only verbally).[33] This provides a significant analogue for Apollo's priestess, the Sibyl — her association with Apollo is underlined by the unusual epithet, *Amphrysia* (*A.* 6.398)[34] — who is also guilty of deceiving Aeneas by withholding information, in the sense of distracting him from the contemplation of those issues which the ideology of empire seems concerned to ignore. Of course there is much contemplation and reflection by Aeneas in Book 6 and this will be discussed below.[35] What needs emphasising here is the way in which Aeneas' potentiality for reflection is never allowed by the Sibyl to interfere with the onward march towards Anchises and Rome's future. Aeneas has to be distracted if he is to take charge of Rome's ideology and Rome's empire, for that ideology would shatter and that empire would not exist, if the principal ministers of empire were not oblivious of the personal suffering, loss and nullification which their actions engender.

The word 'oblivious' is used advisedly. Aeneas will have to *forget* the suffering which he has encountered in the underworld, if he is to go on to become the founder of Rome's empire: he will have to become *immemor*. The Orphic-Pythagorean doctrine of the reincarnation of souls serves Virgil's purpose most admirably here; it becomes a metaphor for Aeneas' psychological development.[36] At *A.* 6.748-51 Anchises explains to Aeneas that the souls

allowed personally to witness the justice in operation; 2. It is conveyed to Aeneas verbally by the Sibyl, the priestess of the dissembling god, Apollo (see *A.* 6.343ff.) — a priestess who enshrouds truth in darkness (*obscuris uera inuoluens*, *A.* 6.100).

[33] *Cf.* Segal, [11] 649: 'The god's [Apollo's] prophecy is fulfilled in the barest, cruellest terms'.

[34] The only other occurrence of this epithet in classical Latin seems to be Ovid, *Met.* 15.703. For the Sibyl's association with Apollo see also *A.* 6.35, 77, 101, 628.

[35] See pp. 168ff.

[36] Camps' ostentatiously simplistic thesis [2] 26 that 'the doctrine of reincarnation is brought in simply to introduce in its turn the pageant of Roman heroes' ignores the relevance of the reincarnation motif to Aeneas' psychological development. *Cf.* A. Cartault, *L'art de Vergile dans*

destined for reincarnation (and Anchises is concerned primarily with the souls of future Romans, the souls in fact of his own offspring — *hanc prolem ... meorum*, *A.*6.717) have to drink the waters of Lethe and forget all their previous experience, they have to become *immemores* (*A.*6.750), before they can desire to return to bodily existence.

has omnis, ubi mille rotam uoluere per annos,
Lethaeum ad fluuium deus euocat agmine magno,
scilicet immemores supera ut conuexa reuisant
rursus, et incipiant in corpora uelle reuerti.

(*A.*6.748-51)

All these [souls], when they have rolled time's wheel a thousand years,
The god summons in great procession to Lethe's stream,
To ensure they revisit the sky's vault without memory
Again, and start to want to return to the body.

Similarly Aeneas, the first of Anchises' offspring, the first Roman (*A.*6.851), will have to become *immemor*; he will have to forget the experiences of his past or rather, to be more specific, he will have to forget the individual dissolution, tragedy and wastage which have confronted him in his past, if he is to achieve the spiritual resurrection (in less figurative terms, the psychological reorientation) necessary for him to go up to earth as the bearer of Rome's future, her imperial mission, her ideology.

It is significant that Aeneas does not rejoice at any time during the scene with Anchises, and that too despite Anchises' statement that the purpose of his revelations is to make Aeneas rejoice with him in the finding of Italy:

quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta.

(*A.*6.718)

That you may rejoice the more with me in Italy found.

Aeneas in the underworld is too aware of the suffering before him (see esp. *A.*6.719-21) to find cause for jubilation in the metaphysical and ideological maxims of Anchises.[37] The socio-moral vision of Rome's future has dramatic impact on Aeneas, as on the Sibyl (both 'marvel', *mirantibus*, *A.* 6.854), but, as the immediately ensuing Marcellus inquiry reveals (*A.* 6.860ff.), it generates no instant joy. Anchises in fact has to work on Aeneas; he has to make him *immemor* of the past, inflaming his mind with passion for greatness to come:

---

l'Énéide (Paris 1926) 476. Otis, on the other hand, [4] 169 and [2] 301 sees that there is relevance but misconstrues it.

[37] Contrast Otis [4] 179, and D. R. Dudley, 'A Plea for Aeneas', *G&R* n.s. 8 (1961) 59 — two exponents of the common but misleading view that for Aeneas Anchises' revelation 'changes the world and brings hope instead of despair' (Dudley 59). Note, however, M. A. Di Cesare, *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's Aeneid* (New York and London 1974) — 'For his part, Aeneas is not grandly inspired' (p. 118) — who yet misses the import both of *mirantibus* (*A.* 6.854) and of the indoctrination at *A.* 6.889.

quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
incenditque animum famae uenientis amore,
exim bella uiro memorat quae deinde gerenda.

(*A.* 6.888-90)

After Anchises has led his son through point after point
And inflamed his mind with love of coming fame,
Then he tells the man the wars he must wage from now on.

The import of this terse, suggestive passage has been almost universally misunderstood. The poet is drawing the reader's attention to the fact that Aeneas, after his experiences in the underworld, after his immediate contact with the human pain and tragedy generated by (among other things) his own pursuit of empire, does not rejoice spontaneously in the splendour of his destiny; rather he is essentially the passive subject of an indoctrination or catechisation process[38] (his father takes him through the details one by one — *per singula*, 888) aimed at turning his whole psychology away from the loss and suffering of the past (of which he must now become *immemor*) towards the renown and accolades of the future — *famae uenientis*, 889. The culminating act of this process — an act which has to be completed before the details of the *bella deinde gerenda* ('wars he must wage from now on', 890) can be safely passed on (*exim*, 'then', 890, is emphatic) — is the firing of his mind by his father, the fate-figure, Anchises, with love of future glory.

The fire image (*incendit*, 'inflamed' or 'fired', 889) is important; it is integral to the passage's meaning. Through its use Virgil infuses Anchises' action with the previous, almost ubiquitous, associations of fire with *furor* and destruction,[39] and thus imparts to it connotations of the most menacing and prophetic kind. The implication is that the *amor* with which Anchises inflames Aeneas, the passion for greatness, for glory, for fame, the passion which makes Aeneas oblivious of the past and directs him towards the future, will be as powerful, as irrational, as indiscriminately destructive as the flames that consumed both Troy and Dido.[40] *Aeneas immemor* will be no harmless harbinger of peace.

[38] Observe Anchises' earlier catechising tone:

et dubitamus adhuc uirtutem extendere factis
aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?

(*A.* 6.806-07)

And do we still hesitate to enlarge manhood with deeds
Or does fear prevent the settling on Ausonian land?

Williams [6] 59f. rightly notes the importance of these lines but ignores the significance of Aeneas' failure to reply to Anchises' question. With *A.* 6.806 *cf. G.* 2.433.

[39] See pp. 126-32.

[40] The destructive nature of *famae uenientis amor* is observed also by Putnam [16] 412, who comments that in Book 7 Virgil 'warns that any search for *fama* may mislead even to the point of bringing death'. It is also worth noting the parallelism between *famae uenientis amor* (*A.* 6.889) and the *ripae ulterioris amor* ('passion for the further bank', *A.* 6.314) felt by the pitiful horde of souls

This notion of *Aeneas immemor* is central to the understanding of the poem. Reflection, as the *Georgics'* emblematic account of *immemor* Orpheus' wasted *labor* testifies (*G.*4.490ff.), of Virgil's sustained preoccupation with man's psychological vulnerability and its relationship to failure, it underlies the poet's presentation of the Trojan hero in the post-revelation books. As comparative analysis shows. In the first half of the *Aeneid* Aeneas displays an enormous potentiality for commitment to the values of the private world, the values of sympathy, understanding, friendship, love — values which assert the primacy of the claims of the individual and the person rather than those of destiny or the state. It was observed above how throughout Books 1-5 Aeneas' behaviour on the whole is governed by values of a predominantly personal kind. But it is important to note that in Book 6 itself — the book in which the more public demands of history and empire are impressed upon Aeneas — the Trojan hero still exhibits profoundly personal values. His encounters with the souls on the near-side of the Styx, with Palinurus, Dido and Deiphobus are characterised by intense pity (see esp. *miseratus*, *A.*6.332, *miseratur*, *A.*6.476), tender love (*dulci amore*, *A.*6.455), abiding friendship (note the repetition of *amice* at *A.*6.507 and 509), sensitivity of response to the injustice of personal tragedy (*sortemque animi miseratus iniquam*, 'pitying in his heart their unjust fate', *A.*6.332; *casu concussus iniquo*, 'stunned by the injustice of what had happened', *A.*6.475),[41] and deep and vibrant sorrow (*demisit lacrimas*, 'he sent down tears', *A.*6.455; *cf. A.*6.468, 476, 539). Indeed the tears for Palinurus which Aeneas sheds in the opening line (*sic fatur lacrimans*, 'so he speaks, weeping', *A.*6.1) foreshadow the personal melancholy and sadness which Aeneas displays throughout the entire sixth *Aeneid* (*cf.* also *A.*6.156, 176, 185, 483, 699). And of course Aeneas' motivation in undertaking the journey into the underworld is singularly personal. The *amor* and *cupido* (*A.*6.133) which are the psychological main-springs of his descent into Hades have reference to the hero's love of his father and his desire to see him (*vid. A.*6.108-09);[42] while the *pietas* which enables him to vanquish the difficulties of the *catabasis* (*A.*6.688; *cf. A.*6.9, 403, 405) concerns Aeneas' personal devotion to his father.[43]

---

clamouring to be ferried to the other side of the Styx. Both passions are delusive; both lead to horror, suffering and pain.

[41] A strong word for emotional disturbance, *concussus* ('stunned') is used to describe Aeneas' reaction on only two other occasions in the poem: after the ship-burning of Book 5 (*A.* 5.700) and at the end of the same book after the loss of Palinurus is discovered (*A.* 5.869). Significantly the word is not used of Aeneas after Book 6. Some read *percussus* at *A.* 6.475. The point is not affected.

[42] There is of course no difficulty in reconciling Aeneas' love for his father and his desire to see him with his slow rate of progress through Hades. His response to the suffering of those he encounters is indicative of the same profoundly personal values exhibited by his filial *amor* and *pietas*.

[43] Williams [6] 56 wrongly translates *tua pietas* at *A.* 6.687-88 as 'your sense of mission'. The *pietas* here, as elsewhere in Book 6 (*cf.* also *A.* 6.176 and 232), has as its object another human

These personal values evident in Aeneas' behaviour in Book 6 and given their most poignant expression in the hero's intense response to human suffering demonstrate an emphasis upon the primacy of the individual antipathetic to the impersonal, public claims of empire. Aeneas' awareness of the tragedy of the individual dissolution generated by the search for empire and for fame, were it allowed to dictate his future conduct, would ensure the discontinuance of the imperial mission. Before he emerges from the underworld, Aeneas' personal *amor*, personal *cupido*, and personal *pietas* will need to be repressed by an impersonal *amor*, impersonal *cupido*, impersonal *pietas*, which have as their object not the individual or the person, but fame, glory, empire, history, and destiny. If the Trojan hero is to be able to carry out the demands of the task with which he is entrusted, his response to the individual will have to give way to *famae uenientis amor*, and he himself become *immemor* of the individual suffering which follows in empire's wake, of the cost in human wastage of the pursuit of the imperial dream, of the human loss and nullification to which in his experiences not only in Book 6 but in the first half of the *Aeneid* as a whole he has shown himself so forcefully alive (e.g. *A*. 1.220ff., 459ff., *A*. 2.790ff., *A*. 3.709ff., *A*. 4.393-95, *A*. 5.869).

Books 7-12 testify to the success of this induced amnesia. It is not merely that in the second half of the poem Aeneas fails to recall the individual suffering which he has witnessed in his past, the tragic deaths, for example, of Creusa, Palinurus, Deiphobus or Dido — although that this in itself is important is indicated by the way in which Virgil is careful on occasion to draw the reader's attention to the remnants of Aeneas' experience which might have been expected to help him *not* to forget and which were always close at hand (note that the antique bowl promised by Ascanius as a reward to Nisus at *A*. 9.266 was a gift from Sidonian Dido, and that in Book 11 the 'twin robes stiff with gold and purple' [*geminas uestis auroque ostroque rigentis*, *A*. 11.72][44] which Aeneas brings out to cover the corpse of Pallas were made by Dido's own hands [*A*. 11.74f.] — a labour of joy [*laeta laborum*, *A*. 11.73]). Aeneas' obliviousness goes further than this. Made more conspicuous by the potentially disruptive broodings of Book 8 (*A*. 8.18ff., 520ff.) and of the early part of

---

person. In *A*. 6.687-88 the person concerned is of course Aeneas' father, Anchises, as the phrase *exspectata parenti* ('which your father counted upon', *A*. 6.687), which Williams curiously ignores, indicates.

[44] Both *geminas* and *auro* (significantly repeated at *A*. 11.75) seem specifically chosen here because of their association with death and destruction. For the destructive connotations of *auro* see the discussion of the Daedalus picture above (pp. 139-42) and that of the golden bough below (pp. 164-68); for those of *geminas* see p. 106, n. 41. Note that the emotive impact of the sudden appearance of these cloaks — and thus their significance — is intensified by the allusion to the cloak made by Dido (*A*. 4.261-64) which Aeneas wore as he supervised the building of Carthage (*A*. 11.75 = *A*. 4.264). For other allusions to Dido in the Aeneas-Pallas relationship, see D. Gillis, *Eros and Death in the Aeneid* (Rome 1983) 53ff.

Book 10 (*A.* 10.159f., 217), each terminated by divine reassurance of Trojan success, Aeneas' conduct of the war in Latium manifests almost total disregard of the lessons which his painful experience of human suffering ought to have taught him: the enormity, injustice and irrecompensible nature of the human loss produced by the search for *fama* and for empire, the disparity in fact between achievement and cost[45] — lessons of which he seemed aware not only in his tortured encounters in the underworld (see esp. *A.* 6.719-21) but also in the much earlier temple episode of Book 1.[46] It is one of the *Aeneid*'s most searching observations that it is precisely because these lessons are ignored, precisely because Aeneas fails to learn from his own experience, both as lived and as pictorially represented (and the Daedalus engravings are as important in this context as the pictures on Juno's temple), that the bearer of Rome's future reproduces the errors and tragedy of the past, resurrecting the Trojan war in Italy and becoming himself a second Pyrrhus, another Achilles reborn.

This last point is important and has been widely misconstrued.[47] When the Sibyl, *obscuris uera inuoluens* ('wrapping truth in darkness', *A.* 6.100) prophesies to Aeneas —

bella, horrida bella,
et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno,
non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra
defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
natus et ipse dea.

(*A.* 6.86-90)

Wars, bristling wars,
I see and the Tiber foaming deep with blood.
No Simois, no Xanthus, no Greek encampment
Will you lack; another Achilles born in Latium,
He too a goddess' son.

— the *alius Achilles* referred to is not, as has been generally supposed,[48] Turnus, but Aeneas himself. Prior to Book 6 the shadow of Achilles has dogged Aeneas throughout the whole of his journey to Italy. At Troy Aeneas' senseless heroics found their analogue (especially through the effective use of the serpent

---

[45] On Aeneas' behaviour in the early part of Book 11 (esp. *A.* 11.39 ff.) — which *in a sense* constitutes an exception to this 'disregard' — see p. 122 above, n. 75, and below, pp. 158 ff.

[46] See pp. 112 f.

[47] Even W. S. Anderson in his valuable study, 'Vergil's Second *Iliad*', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 17-30, concludes disappointingly: 'It is he [Aeneas] who has honour and victory on his side in the combined roles of Achilles, Menelaus, and Agamemnon' (30). *Cf.* also L. A. Mackay, 'Achilles as model for Aeneas', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 11-16, R. D. Williams, 'Virgil and the *Odyssey*', *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 266-74, esp. 273, and Williams [7] 81-119. More to the point are the comments of W. R. Nethercut, 'Invasion in the Aeneid', *G&R* n.s. 15 (1968) 84 n. 2, 86, 95.

[48] See e.g., E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*³ (Stuttgart 1927) *ad loc.*, Fletcher [13] *ad loc.*, Austin [24] *ad loc.*, Anderson [47] 19, Williams [7] 94 f. At *A.* 9.742 of course Turnus *claims* to be a second Achilles.

image at *A.*2.379ff. and *A.*2.471ff.)[49] in the murderous acts of Pyrrhus, Achilles' son and symbolic reincarnation,[50] and, as if to confirm this analogue, Virgil had Helenus in the central episode at Buthrotum in Book 3 present Aeneas with Pyrrhus' own arms (*arma Neoptolemi, A.* 3.469). At Carthage the pictorial representation of the tragedy caused by Achilles on the plains of Troy did not fail to affect Aeneas (*A.* 1.453ff.), but Virgil was careful to intimate (*animum pictura pascit inani*, 'he feeds his soul on the futile picture', *A.* 1.464) that the lessons which the pictures conveyed would go unlearned:[51] Achillean slaughter and the human loss which Achillean slaughter produces would be re-engendered. Even in the so-called 'interlude' at Sicily the Achilles analogue was close to the fore; for the funeral games which Aeneas celebrated in honour of his father, Anchises, offered an abundance of precise parallels with the games held by Achilles in *Iliad* 23 in honour of the dead Patroclus.[52] No random Homeric allusion, the Venus-Jupiter colloquy of the *Aeneid*'s first book (*A.* 1.223-96) — modelled on Thetis' visit to Zeus on behalf of Achilles in *Iliad* 1 (*Il.* 1.493-530) — proves preface to one of the poem's cardinal motifs.

The Sibyl's prophecy of the *alius Achilles* in Book 6 and the presentation of the arms made by Vulcan in Book 8 continue this analogy between the Trojan hero and Achilles, and develop in the reader the expectation that Aeneas' conduct of the war in Latium will be but the tragic re-enactment of the suffering, death and human carnage generated by Achilles at Troy. In the battle-books of the *Aeneid* this expectation proves well founded. In Book 10 Aeneas' terrifying appearance at the scene of battle (*A.* 10.260ff.) has decided Achillean overtones (the fire imagery recalls Achilles' transfiguration before the trenches in *Iliad* 18.205ff., and the emotive simile at *A.* 10.272ff. comparing Aeneas' impact upon the Italians to that of the fiery Dog-Star upon *mortalibus aegris*, 'suffering mankind', *A.* 10.274, is closely modelled upon Homer's description of Achilles at *Iliad* 22.26ff.), and the indiscriminate slaughter which the Trojan perpetrates, as he rages murderously seeking vengeance for the killing of Pallas (*A.* 10.510ff.), is designed to constitute a patent resurrection of the wantonly violent and bloody vengeance exacted by Achilles for the death of his beloved Patroclus (*Iliad* 20-21). Even the eight Italian youths that Aeneas captures — with the intention of offering them as live-sacrifices to the shade of Pallas (*A.* 10.517-20) — have their prototype in the twelve Trojan youths whom Achilles promises to sacrifice (*Iliad* 18.336-37, 23.22-23) and does in fact

[49] See pp. 129 f.

[50] For Pyrrhus as 'Achilles reborn' see B. M. Knox, 'The Serpent and the Flame: the Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 71 (1950) 394-95 (reprinted in Commager [21] 137-38). Note especially Knox's comment: 'Only the worst of the father is reborn in the son' (395).

[51] See p. 113.

[52] See, e.g., R. D. Williams' edition, *Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford 1960) xiii-xvi, and *ad* 109, 110 f., 129, 132, 137-8, 144-7, 163, 188 f., 282 f., 284, 324, 325, 327 f., *et passim*.

sacrifice (Aeneas similarly carries out his intention — *A.* 11.81-82) to the spirit of his erstwhile comrade. From Book 11 Aeneas is largely absent, but note that the analogy with Achilles is still present (*A.* 11.81-82, 438-40), even if its presence is not all-pervasive. In Book 12, however, when Aeneas dominates the action once more, Virgil takes care (through both thematic and verbal parallels with earlier episodes in the *Aeneid* and a whole series of specific allusions to Homer) to permeate the entire fabric of the narrative with thematically functional analogies between Turnus and both Hector and Priam, and between Aeneas and both Pyrrhus and Achilles — analogies the object and the effect of which are to ensure that the conduct of Aeneas in Book 12 is seen as conduct of *alius Achilles.*[53] Indeed the correspondences between the final scene of the *Aeneid* and the pictures on the temple to Juno in Book 1 serve to show that the portrait of *saeuus Achilles*, which confronted Aeneas at Carthage and to which he responded with such deep emotion and insight, was a prognostic image of Aeneas himself.[54] Ignoring the past, *Aeneas immemor* recreates it as the future.

But although Aeneas does become *immemor*, although *famae uenientis amor* succeeds in banishing to the remotest recesses of the hero's mind his awareness of the human nullification involved in empire, that feature of Aeneas' psychology which gave rise to such awareness — his immense potentiality for commitment to the values of the private world — is not obliterated entirely. Aeneas' sensibility is such an ingrained and integral feature of his psychology that even the bright glories promised by the future cannot destroy it utterly. What happens is much worse; they pervert it. Briefly displayed in the melancholy moments that follow Evander's entrusting of his son to Aeneas (*A.* 8.520-22),[55] the Trojan hero's susceptibility to the claims of the private world — a susceptibility which it had proved necessary for him to suppress if the calls of history and destiny were to be answered — bursts forth in the battle-books only to reveal itself in the most ugly and misshapen form.[56] In Book 10 Aeneas' reaction to the death of Pallas is to engage in a vendetta — cruel, merciless, violent, wantonly indiscriminate, unbounded in its fury — which is yet direct product of personal values:

---

[53] See p. 103.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] To draw attention to Aeneas' value-response to the father-son relationship of Evander and Pallas and to his role as surrogate father Virgil uses the patronymic *Anchisiades* (*A.* 8.521). The same patronymic is used at *A.* 10.822 with complex, ironic effect, when Aeneas responds too late to Lausus' *pietas*.

[56] Contrast D. R. Dudley's view [37] 59 that throughout the second half of the *Aeneid* Aeneas is 'calm and confident — almost too much so, perhaps, and much less interesting than the fallible Aeneas of the first six books'. Strangely on p. 52 of his article Dudley reproaches critics for not reading the *Aeneid* from beginning to end. See also G. E. Duckworth, 'Fate and Free Will in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CJ.* 51 (1955-56) 358, and Segal [21] 48.

Pallas, Euander, in ipsis
omnia sunt oculis, mensae quas aduena primas
tunc adiit, dextraeque datae.

(*A.* 10.515-17)

Pallas, Evander, everything's
There before his eyes, the tables he — a stranger — first
Approached that day, the right hands pledged.

While at the end of Book 12 the Pallas-Aeneas relationship again — a personal relationship of potential richness and value — produces an action startling for its perversion, not eradication, of the values the Trojan hero had earlier, paradigmatically displayed — compassion, love:

ille humilis supplex oculos dextramque precantem
protendens 'equidem merui nec deprecor' inquit;
'utere sorte tua. miseri te si qua parentis
tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis
Anchises genitor) Dauni miserere senectae
et me, seu corpus spoliatum lumine mauis,
redde meis. uicisti et uictum tendere palmas
Ausonii uidere; tua est Lauinia coniunx,
ulterius ne tende odiis.' stetit acer in armis
Aeneas uoluens oculos dextramque repressit;
et iam iamque magis cunctantem flectere sermo
coeperat, infelix umero cum apparuit alto
balteus et notis fulserunt cingula bullis
Pallantis pueri, uictum quem uulnere Turnus
strauerat atque umeris inimicum insigne gerebat.
ille, oculis postquam saeui monimenta doloris
exuuiasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: 'tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.'
hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
feruidus; ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

(*A.* 12.930-52)

Humbled and suppliant, he [Turnus] lifts eyes and outstretched
hand in prayer:
'I have indeed earned this and make no plea against it.
Use your chance. But if an unhappy father's distress
Can touch you, I ask — for you too had such a father
In Anchises — have pity on Daunus' years
And give me back — or, if you wish, my body robbed of life —
To my kin. You've won; the Ausonians have seen me, beaten,
Stretch out my hands. Lavinia is yours to wed.
Do not take hatred further.' Aeneas stood there
Fierce in arms, his eyes restless, he checked his hand.
And now more and more as he wavered the speech began
To stir him, when high on the shoulder appeared the luckless

Baldric and sword-belt glittering with familiar studs —
The lad Pallas', whom Turnus defeated and laid low
With wound and on his shoulders wore his enemy's mark.
Aeneas, after his eyes drank in reminders of savage grief,
The armour stripped, inflamed with rage and terrible
In his anger: 'Are you, decked with spoils of my comrades,
To be snatched from me? Pallas, Pallas with this wound
Sacrifices you and draws payment from guilty blood.'
As he speaks, he buries the steel full in Turnus' breast
Burning. His limbs go limp with cold; with a groan
The life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

Compassionate towards Pallas, overwhelmed with pain, *dolor*, on his behalf, Aeneas rejects the appeal to compassion and *pietas* which Turnus makes, brutalises the relationship between himself and his charge, deforms the filial love and compassion, the personal *pietas*, which that relationship engendered. It is to Aeneas' credit that he hesitates (*cunctantem*, *A*. 12.940), that the values which he exhibited in the first half of the poem begin to have some effect on what had once been a responsive, comprehending moral consciousness. But it is a sign of the Romanised Aeneas, restricted, trammelled, by the dehumanising commitment of Book 6, that he fails absolutely to see what is happening and ends the poem with a crazed and bloody act of self-deception.

The transformed operation of Aeneas' sensibility, of the values central to his private world, laid bare in the epic's final presentment, does not come unanticipated. When Aeneas responds to the tragedy of individual loss with compassion and regret, as he does in his speeches over the dead bodies of Lausus (*A*. 10.825-30) and Pallas (*A*. 11.42-58), the perversion of his sensibility is singularly apparent. In both cases the compassion is severely confined, does not develop into any real understanding, produces no metamorphosis in Aeneas' violent and murderous behaviour, but, restricted, momentary manifestation of sorrow, generates immediately acts of merciless killing (*A*. 10.896ff., *A*. 11.81f.).[57] Aeneas' last words to Lausus prove index to the man:

hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem:
Aeneae magni dextra cadis.

(*A*. 10.829f.)

Yet this, luckless boy, will console you for your piteous death:
You fall by great Aeneas' hand.

In Books 1 and 6 Aeneas' compassion for human dissolution caused by the pursuit of fame brought with it a rejection of fame as a value; for the death of Lausus Aeneas actually offers fame as compensation. Like the nature of the vengeance exacted in Books 10 and 12, like the copious tears shed for Pallas

[57] See pp. 94-99. 122 n. 75.

— as Lausus was (*A.* 10.825), as Marcellus was (*A.* 6.882), *miserandus puer* (*A.* 11.42) — Aeneas' words over the youth he has slain betray an exceptional sensibility, but one fettered, perverted by the demands of empire.

Perverted too paradoxically by itself. Product in part of Anchises' indoctrinating fervour, Aeneas' moral and experiential amnesia and the transformed sensibility to which this gives rise are product too of the hero's own humanity. Aeneas' response to the socio-moral vision of Rome's future is as psychologically inevitable as it is inevitably disastrous:

> tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
> (hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
> parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.
>
> (*A.* 6.851-53)
>
> You, Roman, remember to rule nations with your command —
> These will be your arts — to stamp peace with men's practice,
> To spare the humbled and to crush the proud in war.

Despite his earlier indifference to Anchises' dynastic joy (*A.* 6.719-21), Aeneas cannot — in psychological terms cannot — resist this vision. The stirring apocalypse of *A.* 6.847ff. (its emotional impact reflected in the 'amazement' of its addressees — *mirantibus*, *A.* 6.854) seems to offer the Trojan hero a way of compensating for the human loss which he has witnessed in the underworld and for which in part he has been responsible; and it translates to the public world the cardinal value of Aeneas' private world, the value which his response to human suffering in the first half of the *Aeneid* and especially in Book 6 has conspicuously displayed: compassion — in Anchises' apocalypse: mercy (*parcere subiectis*, 'to spare the humbled', *A.* 6.853). The bitter irony is that the pursuit of the socio-moral ideal outlined by Anchises entails an espousal of *fama* and its *amor* and a substantial blindness to individual suffering, which in turn ensure the non-fulfilment of the ideal, the perversion of the values which Aeneas initially so fully displays, and the cyclic recreation of the human loss and dissolution which Aeneas had mourned so deeply and attempting to compensate for which pursues the imperial dream. It is the essence of the penetrating realism of Virgil's portrait of Aeneas and pointer to the poet's despair that Aeneas is dehumanised by his own humanity. Pursuing the future to compensate for the past, he forgets the past and resurrects it as the future. In the saga of *Aeneas immemor* the central paradox of human aspiration — the inevitability with which the attempt to produce a better and more just world produces a less just, less joyous one — is enacted with arresting and tragic specificity.

'Fama' and the Golden Bough

But at least, it may be argued, Aeneas achieves a permanent place in history; he wins for himself and his descendants the fame, the glory, the eternal name,

which empire promises to its ministers, and thus transcends, if vicariously, the limitations and evanescence of his own mortality. There can at least be some comfort in that.

In Book 6 itself, as throughout the entire *Aeneid*, Virgil forcefully demonstrates that there can be no real comfort in *fama*. The imbalance between the accolades achieved through empire and their cost in terms of human dissolution and tragedy is of such a magnitude as to render the glory, the lifeless immortality, bestowed upon the individual by history worthless and empty. Note how, for example, Virgil takes great pains to emphasise the compensation which Misenus and Palinurus receive for their role as instruments of Rome's destiny, and takes pains also to suggest the compensation's inadequacy, its futility. Misenus, who has to die for Aeneas to enter the underworld, is awarded a massive tomb and an eternal name.[58]

> at pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum
> imponit suaque arma uiro remumque tubamque
> monte sub aërio, qui nunc Misenus ab illo
> dicitur aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen.
>
> (*A*.6.232-35)
>
> But *pius* Aeneas raises a massive tomb,
> Laying on it the man's armour and oar and trumpet
> Beneath a towering peak, which now is called Misenus
> After him and keeps the name eternal through the ages.

It is of course ironic that Misenus' challenge of the gods (*A*. 6.171-74) ends in a form of vicarious divinity for him, the timelessness of the eternal name.[59] This should not however encourage us to take the manner of his death too seriously. Virgil explicitly questions whether the account is worth believing (*si credere dignum est*, *A*. 6.173), and from the interlocking of references to Misenus' death and funeral (*A*.6.149-89, 212-35) with the passages concerned with Aeneas' talisman for entrance to the underworld (*A*. 6.136-48, 190-211) it is clear that Misenus' death is in essence the sacrifice necessary for Aeneas to be able to visit the land of the dead without dying. Misenus' death enables Aeneas, though alive, to meet with his father in the underworld and to receive from him the ideology of empire's mission and the promises vouchsafed for the future. The *aeternum nomen* is thus the reward which Misenus receives for his sacrificial role in the development of empire; but, if this is adequate compensation, why does Virgil describe his death as 'undeserved' (*indigna*, *A*.6.163)? The focus upon Misenus' loyalty and steadfastness (*A*. 6.164ff.) reinforces the sense of the injustice of his end; while the marked contrast between the lifelessness of the

---

[58] As will be obvious, my discussion of the *aeternum nomen* owes much to the excellent analysis of Segal [11] 636ff.

[59] *Ibid*. 638.

aeternum nomen and the urgent, immediate vitality which it replaces (see esp. *A.* 6.164-67, and note how the symbols of this vitality — Misenus' arms, oar and trumpet — are buried with him, *A.* 6.233) underlines the failure of nominal immortality to make recompense for personal dissolution.

If there was any doubt about the injustice and tragedy of Misenus' death, there is certainly none about the meanness of the end inflicted upon Palinurus (see esp. *A.*6.337-83), the sacrifice necessary for the final, successful voyage to Italy (*A.* 5.814-15). The emphasis upon his innocence in the account of his death at the end of Book 5 (*insonti*, *A.* 5.841), the concentration upon his loyalty, courage, and endurance both in that scene (*A.* 5.843-56) and in Palinurus' own speech to Aeneas in Book 6 (esp. *A.* 6.351-54), the cruel irony of Apollo's prophecy (*A.* 6.345-46) and of Palinurus' own situation (it is Palinurus who now requires to be conducted across the waters — *A.* 6.370-71), the stress upon the intense wretchedness and desperation of the situation (*multa maestum ... in umbra*, 'a sorrowful figure amid the deep gloom', *A.* 6.340; *misero*, 'in my wretchedness', *A.* 6.370) — a wretchedness made to seem all the more severe by its contrast with the more fortunate outcome of the Odyssean ship-wreck upon which the description of Palinurus' is based[60] — combine to impress upon the reader the injustice, misery and viciousness of Palinurus' death. The abrupt and unfeeling words of the Sibyl's clipped reprimand serve only to exacerbate the pathos and cruelty of Palinurus' fate:

'unde haec, o Palinure, tibi tam dira cupido?
tu Stygias inhumatus aquas amnemque seuerum
Eumenidum aspicies, ripamue iniussus adibis?
desine fata deum flecti sperare precando,
sed cape dicta memor, duri solacia casus.
nam tua finitimi, longe lateque per urbes
prodigiis acti caelestibus, ossa piabunt
et statuent tumulum et tumulo sollemnia mittent,
aeternumque locus Palinuri nomen habebit.'
his dictis curae emotae pulsusque parumper
corde dolor tristi; gaudet cognomine terrae.

(*A.* 6.373-83)

'Whence, Palinurus, this such perverse desire?
Shall you unburied view Stygian waters and the Furies'
Austere stream or approach the bank unbidden?
Cease to hope that gods' decrees are changed by prayer.
Take and remember these words to solace your hard fate.
Neighbouring peoples in cities far and wide
Driven by heaven's portents shall expiate your bones
And build a tomb and to the tomb make yearly offerings,
And the place shall hold Palinurus' name eternal.'

---

[60] *Ibid.* 649 and 657 n. 38.

These words banished care and drove for a short while
Grief from sad heart; he rejoices in land named after him.

Although the prophetess seeks to console Palinurus in his hard fortune (*duri solacia casus*, 377), the *aeternum nomen* which she promises as his reward (381) banishes his cares (*curae*, 382) and his grief (*dolor*, 383) only for a short while, only *parumper* (382).[61] *Fama* can offer no lasting cause for joy; the reparation which it provides for individual annihilation has little value.[62]

The worthlessness of *fama*, *gloria* and the *aeternum nomen* forced upon the reader in the Misenus and Palinurus episodes functions as precursorial criticism of the *famae uenientis amor* with which Anchises inflames Aeneas before sending him through the ivory gate (*A*. 6.889ff.). Indeed so determined is Virgil that the hollow and empty nature of the accolades promised by empire be fully comprehended by the reader that he opens the second half of his poem with a potent questioning of their worth:

tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
et nunc seruat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen
Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signat.
(*A*. 7.1-4)

You also, nurse of Aeneas, Caieta,
Dying have given our coast eternal fame;
Now your repute guards the place and a name marks the bones
(If such glory means anything) in great Hesperia.

Si qua est ea gloria — 'if such glory means anything'.[63] Virgil's explicit scepticism here about the value of this most central of empire's promises follows immediately upon Anchises' kindling of Aeneas with love of future glory (*A*. 6.889) and the Trojan hero's exit through the ivory gate (*A*. 6.893ff.), and prefaces the detailed presentation in the second half of the poem of the destruction and extirpation resulting from the influence of this promise upon human motivation. The crucial positioning of this overt scepticism reinforces its impact and ensures that the deluded and deluding nature of the search for fame and glory is revealed with clarity and definition.

---

[61] *Ibid*. 653: '*Parumper* is the vital word'. J. W. Hunt, *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1973), seems not to notice *parumper* and thus misconstrues: 'He [Palinurus] ends happy in the name of land, if not the reality' (p. 45).

[62] Otis' view [2] 292 that the Palinurus episode provides Aeneas with a 'lesson in both divine law and divine clemency, in the inexorability and the justice of fate' ignores the emphatic cruelty of Palinurus' plight, the inherent melancholy of the episode itself, and the thematic consequences of *parumper*.

[63] On the significance of this clause see E. Fraenkel, 'Some Aspects of the Structure of *Aeneid* VII', *JRS* 35 (1945) 2, K. J. Reckford, 'Latent Tragedy in *Aeneid* VII. 1-285', *AJP* 82 (1961) 254, Segal [21] 56ff., and Putnam [16] 411-12.

The description, 'deluded and deluding', has been chosen with specific intent. Aeneas' search for *fama* is not only misdirected, it misdirects; above all, it misdirects the young. In Book 7, for example, Ascanius aims the fateful arrow at the pet stag of the family of Tyrrhus, 'inflamed with passion for signal glory' (*eximiae laudis succensus amore*, *A.* 7.496); while in Book 9 the quest for *fama* (*A.* 9.195) and *laudes* (*A.* 9.197) so fires the *iuuenes*, Nisus and Euryalus (*ardorem*, 'fire', *A.* 9.184; *ardentem*, 'blazing' *A.* 9.198; *cf.* also *incensus*, 'inflamed', *A.* 9.342, and *feruidus*, 'burning', *A.* 9.350), that they engage in an enterprise which has as its consequence the generation of wanton and bloody carnage and the annihilation of themselves. The thoughtlessness (*immemorem*, *A.* 9.373) and mindlessness (*amens*, *A.* 9.424) which are the proximate causes of the youths' own individual dissolution are but the psychological corollaries of the naive drive for glory.[64]

The example of Pallas, the child of the Arcadian king, Evander, must also be mentioned here. Like Ascanius, he is the specific responsibility of Aeneas (*A.* 8.514-17), and, like Ascanius,[65] his whole psychology becomes bound and limited by thoughts of personal greatness. When he confronts the Italian champion, Turnus, he is motivated not by a wish to end the tragic war, but by the desire for his own greater glory:

> aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis
> aut leto insigni.
>
> (*A.* 10.449-50)
>
> Either I'll be praised now for taking the prize-spoils
> Or for a glorious death.

Jupiter's trenchant comment that 'the task of manhood is to enlarge fame by deeds' (*famam extendere factis/hoc virtutis opus*, *A.* 10.468-69, *cf.* *A.* 6.806) focusses the reader's attention upon the precise nature of Pallas' motivation. The effect of Aeneas' tuition at *A.* 10.159-62 has been far from salutary; his impact upon the young is catastrophic.[66] The guilt which the death of Pallas arouses in him is well founded. At least in the *Eclogues* Gallus' intrusion into Arcadia harmed only himself.

---

64 For a fuller discussion of the Nisus-Euryalus *excursus* see pp. 89-92, 120f.

65 See, e.g., Ascanius' *aristeia* in Book 9.590-663, at the conclusion of which Ascanius has to be restrained from fighting, 'eager though he was for battle' (*auidum pugnae*, *A.* 9.661).

66 Important in this connection is Aeneas' address to his son in Book 12 (*A.* 12.435-40) — the only words which he speaks to Ascanius in the poem. The tone of moral righteousness which pervades the speech ought not to blind the reader to (a) the corrupting *dextera-praemia* association and the deluded assumption that the *praemia* ('rewards') are worth the *labor* ('toil'), and (b) the inherently disastrous nature of Aeneas' recommendation that the heroic *exempla* of himself and Hector be not so much learned from as imitated. Significantly the only advice which *Aeneas immemor* gives to his son in the poem is an injunction to repeat the heroic mentality of the past. Contrast Williams [7] 238.

To return to Book 6, where the tragic imbalance between the value of *fama* and its cost, seen so vividly in the conduct and deaths of Nisus, Euryalus and Pallas, is pointedly emphasised. Note in fact how Virgil draws attention to this imbalance not only through the critical examination of the *aeternum nomen* in the Palinurus and Misenus episodes, but also through the emotive concentration upon human suffering and loss throughout the entire length of the book — a concentration sharpened and intensified by the oppressive and pervasive imagery of shade, darkness, obscurity and night — and (most enigmatically) through the complex symbolism of the golden bough.[67]

The two passages describing the golden bough (*A.* 6.136-48, 190-211) are juxtaposed with descriptions of Misenus' death and funeral (*A.* 6.149-89, 212-35); and it is clear that Misenus' death is the sacrifice necessary for Aeneas to receive the talisman which will enable him, though alive, to visit the world of the dead. If Aeneas is to be allowed to enter the land of the dead without dying, then someone else's death has to be substituted for the death of Aeneas. That 'someone else' — the narrative implies — is Misenus.[68]

It is fitting that the golden bough, the talisman for entry to the underworld, the talisman which enables the living to journey to the land of the dead, should represent in terms of its own properties the union of life and death.[69] The bough itself is both living and dead. It is dead in that it is composed of the inorganic metal, gold (note the emphasis upon *metallo* at *A.* 6.114 and the description of the foil tinkling in the wind — *crepitabat brattea*, *A.* 6.209); it is dead in that it belongs to Proserpina, the queen of the dead, the Juno of the underworld (*Iunoni infernae*, *A.* 6.138); it is dead in that it reflects light in the manner of a lifeless substance (*refulsit*, *A.* 6.204) — it emits no light of its own. The bough is alive in that it is a growth from the tree (*fetus*, *A.* 6.141), and when it is plucked another replaces it, the new spray bearing leaf (*frondescit*, *A.* 6.144, *frondentis*, *A.* 6.208) of the same metal.

One of Virgil's aims in introducing the golden bough is undoubtedly to provide a symbol of the paradoxical union of life and death, and in so doing to furnish a symbol of the paradoxical union of the major antinomies which it is the *Aeneid*'s purpose to examine — the antinomies of glory and tragedy,

---

[67] The two most perceptive and valuable discussions of the bough are those of R. A. Brooks, '*Discolor Aura*: Reflections on the Golden Bough', *AJP* 74 (1953) 260-80 (reprinted in Commager [21] 143-63), and Segal [11 and 21]. A convenient summary of some of the extensive, if not always highly relevant, literature on this topic can be found in S. Kresic, 'Le rameau d'or chez Virgile', *EMC* 12 (1968) 92-102.

[68] *Cf.* Servius *ad A.* 6.136: *ramus enim necesse erat ut et unius causa esset interitus: unde et statim mortem subiungit Miseni* ('For it was necessary for the bough to be the cause of one death; wherefore immediately he juxtaposes the death of Misenus'). See also Segal [11] 622: 'The order of the narrative suggests that Misenus' life is in a sense the price of the bough, as Palinurus' life in Book V is the price of Aeneas' arrival in Italy'.

[69] For a more detailed discussion of the bough's contradictory properties see Segal [11] 624-34.

success and failure, achievement and cost, victory and defeat. But the golden bough is also a symbol in the description of which the poet has specific evaluations to make about these antinomies. Gold is a symbol in the *Aeneid* of (among other things) the promises of empire, a symbol of fame, glory, the eternal name;[70] hence the golden temple (*aurea tecta*, *A.* 6.13) at the gateway to Aeneas' future, the golden age (*aurea saecula*, *A.* 6.792-93) which Augustus is to bring back to Latium, and the golden sea of Actium (*aurea*, *A.* 8.672), which both surrounds and forms the background to the shield's central and culminating picture of the fame and destiny of Aeneas' own descendants (*famamque et fata nepotum*, *A.* 8.731).[71] In concentrating upon the death qualities of the golden bough — and note how these qualities are thrown into prominence by the prevailing imagery of shade and darkness (*opaca*, *A.* 6.136; *obscuris*, *A.* 6.139; *umbrae*, *A.* 6.139; *opacat*, *A.* 6.195; *opaca*, *A.* 6.208), by the intricate connection between the bough, the death of Misenus and access to the world of the dead, and by the previously established association of gold with death and destruction (see esp. *A.* 1.349, *A.* 3.57, *A.* 6.32) — Virgil is not only pointing to the inevitable concatenation of *fama* and human dissolution but also to the imbalance which thereby accrues. The imbalance between the life and death properties of the golden bough reflects the disequilibrium between glory and its price; it represents the failure of *fama* as a value.

The comparison with the mistletoe (*A.* 6.205ff.) is central to this symbolism.

quale solet siluis brumali frigore uiscum
fronde uirere noua, quod non sua seminat arbos,
et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos,
talis erat species auri frondentis opaca
ilice, sic leni crepitabat brattea uento.

(*A.* 6.205-9)

As in the woods in winter's cold the mistletoe
Blooms with strange leaves, a parasite on its tree,
And encircles the round boles with yellow fruit;

[70] This particular symbolism is reinforced in the case of the golden bough (a) by the juxtaposition of Aeneas' seizure of the bough with the funeral of Misenus and the allusion to his *aeternum nomen* (note especially how Aeneas' snatching of the bough and the mention of Misenus' *aeternum nomen* are the culminating points of their respective episodes — *A.* 6.190-211, 212-35) and (b) by the bough's transcendence of death — like the *aeternum nomen* the bough has a lifeless immortality. The linking of gold with *fama* is of course a common, popular association.

[71] Gold is in fact by far the most prominent metal in the shield's 'indescribable fabric' (*non enarrabile textum*, *A.* 8.625) — *cf.* *A.* 8.655, 659, 661, 672, 677; the only other metals to be mentioned in the account at *A.* 8.625ff. are silver (655, 673), bronze (675) and iron (701). Gold is also the metal generally used to denote the shield after the detailed delineation of Book 8 — cf. *A.* 10.243, 271 and 884. The 'goldenness' of the shield would be enhanced by the obvious allusion to the golden shield presented to Augustus in 28/27 B.C. by the Senate and People of Rome (see p. 136 n. 8 above), The golden shields of both Aeneas and Augustus are patent symbols of *fama*.

Such was the sight of leafing gold on the dark
Ilex, as foil tinkled in the gentle wind.

The intimation is that the fame, the glory, the eternal name, which empire and history promise to the individual, like the mistletoe to which the bough is compared, are parasitic — they feed on the lives of others; and that, just as the light which the bough emits takes its sustenance from elsewhere (*refulsit*, *A.* 6.204), so the values of empire have no intrinsic splendour. What brightness they do emit is artificial and illusory; like the gleam of the ivory gate, it attracts only to mislead and to corrupt.

The corrupting and deluding nature of the search for *fama* was considered above; but note how Virgil seems so concerned to focus the reader's attention upon this aspect of the pursuit of glory that he chooses to associate with the golden bough and the *fama* which it symbolises the poem's major image of deceit and corruption — the serpent.[72] The epithet *geminus*, for example, used with decided emphasis of the 'twin' serpents from Tenedos in Book 2.203 and 225, is applied both to the doves (*geminae columbae*, *A.* 6.190) which lead Aeneas to the bough and to the tree (*gemina arbore*, *A.* 6.203) to which the bough is attached.[73] The doves themselves act like serpents: they 'feed' (*pascentes*, *A.* 6.199; *cf. depascitur*, *A.* 2.215 and *pastus*, *A.* 2.471, and also *depasta*, *A.* 5.93), 'raise themselves aloft' (*tollunt se*, *A.* 6.202; *cf. attollentem*, *A.* 2.381), and 'slide' through the liquid air (*lapsae*, *A.* 6.202; *cf. lapsu*, *A.* 2.225, and also *lapsus*, *A.* 5.86). Similarly, the mistletoe to which the bough is compared has serpent characteristics — it 'encircles' the tree which gives it life (*circumdare*, *A.* 6.207; *cf. circum ... dati*, *A.* 2.218-19); while the brightness of the bough itself (*refulsit*, *A.* 6.204) has its own analogue in the glistening sheen of a serpent that has shed its old skin (*nitidus*, *A.* 2.473; *cf.* also the brightness of the serpent at Anchises' tomb — *fulgor*, *A.* 5.88).[74] Even Aeneas' seizing of the bough is described with the same violent word (*corripit*, *A.* 6.210) used of the *gemini angues* when they lay hold of Laocoon (*corripiunt*, *A.* 2.217).

This whole cluster of parallels between the serpents of Book 2 (and, to a lesser extent, the serpent of Book 5) and the golden bough of Book 6 is not likely to be accidental. Rather, Virgil seems concerned to infuse his second description of the bough (*A.* 6.190-211) — the crucial one in which the bough is

---

[72] For the importance of the serpent image in the *Aeneid* see pp. 126-32.

[73] For the significance of *geminus* see p. 106 n. 41. Even if the appearance of two birds is a common motif in folk-tales concerned with the testing of heroes — see Norden [48] *ad loc.*, and C. P. Segal, 'The Hesitation of the Golden Bough: A Reexamination', *Hermes* 96 (1968-69) 77 (and note that the amont of *ancient* evidence, as opposed to Norden's 'heimatlichen Märchenpoesie', is very small indeed) — Virgil's use of *geminae* (*A.* 6.190) for 'two' with reference to the doves and his repetition of it in the expression *gemina arbore* (*A.* 6.203) still require explanation.

[74] On the brightness-destruction association, see the discussion of the ivory gate above, pp. 145 f., and 146 n. 27.

plucked — with the same atmosphere of deceit and corruption which pervaded his account of the fall of Troy. Not that this appears his only purpose. For through this association of bough and serpent the poet also succeeds in suggesting an inextricable connection between the prime symbolic imports of these two images — *fama* and *furor impius*. The bough is dedicated to Juno (*Iunoni infernae*, *A.* 6.138), because they who pluck it are her ministers.

But the golden bough is also part of nature. Aeneas' use of force against the bough (*A.* 6.210) — it does not come easily, as the Sibyl claimed (*A.* 6.146-47), but resists Aeneas (*cunctantem*, *A.* 6.211)[75] — does more than indicate the indissoluble union of *furor* and the pursuit of *fama*; it foreshadows clearly, potently and specifically the subjection through violence of the natural world of pre-Roman Italy. Indeed the particular connotations of the language of Aeneas' violence against the bough — the 'plucking' (*carpe*, *A.* 6.146), 'seizing' (*corripit*, *A.* 6.210), 'breaking' (*refringit*, *A.* 6.210) have patent sexual associations[76] — might seem to hint at a virgin-rape analogue for Aeneas' conquest of Italy, an analogue which would be reinforced by the stress upon the virginity of three important figures in Books 7-12 (Lavinia, Camilla, and Juturna)[77] and by the focus upon the pastoral innocence of the Latin king himself with which the narrative of the 'Iliadic *Aeneid*', the *maius opus*, begins (*A.* 7.45ff.). At any rate the emphatic position of *cunctantem* (*A.* 6.211) brings the bough's resistance to the fore, and enables it to serve as a symbolic illustration of the opposition of the natural world of pastoral Italy to the 'civilising' forces of empire and history (*cf.* the similarly symbolic opposition offered by the remains of the tree sacred to the agricultural god, Faunus, in Book 12)[78] or rather, to be more precise, to serve as a symbolic illustration

[75] Fletcher's comment [13] *ad loc.* that '*cunctari* never implies active resistance' cannot be sound; see, e.g., the description of Palinurus at *A.* 5.856 (*cunctanti*).

[76] For the sexual associations of 'plucking' flowers, trees, etc., see Segal [73] 79 n. 2. Note especially the transparent connotations of *refringit*, which means normally 'breaks open'. The portrayal of Aeneas as *auidus* (*A.* 6.210) intensifies the sexual implications of his act. For an extensive discussion of sexual imagery and symbolism in the *Aeneid*, see Gillis [44], for whom the *Aeneid* is 'a work rivetted on the struggle of Eros and Death precisely as Freud perceived and defined it' (p. 24).

[77] On Lavinia see esp. *A.* 7.53 and *A.* 12.67ff., and also *A.* 7.72, 318, 362, 389; *A.* 11.479. On Camilla and Juturna see pp. 123, 123 n. 76, 105 n. 38.

[78] See pp. 104f. This notion of Aeneas as the destroyer of the pastoral world is of course reinforced by the 'deer episodes' of Books 7 and 12 (see pp. 125f.), by the emotive attention given in Book 11 to the exploits and death of Camilla (a potent, if ambiguous, symbol of the pastoral vitality and freedom of early Italy — see p. 123, 123 n. 78), and by Juturna's own 'pastoral' associations (*A.* 12.139-40). See also *A.* 7.750-60 (the foreshadowed death of Umbro), *A.* 10.550-60 (the slaying of Tarquitus) and *A.* 12.451-58 (Aeneas' return to battle). The dissolution of the idyllic, Arcadian world of Pallas and Evander consequent upon Aeneas' intrusion into it (*A.* 8.102-584, *A.* 11.29-99, esp. 67-71, and 139-81) is perhaps the most conspicuous and carefully delineated instance of this motif. It recalls and provides commentary upon the fragile and vain idealism of the *Eclogues*.

of the tragic and inevitable futility of such opposition. For, like the attempts of Dido (*cunctantem*, *A.*4.133), Palinurus (*cunctanti*, *A.*5.856), Turnus (*cunctantem*, *A.*7.449; *cunctanti*, *A.* 12.919), Vulcan (*cunctantem*, *A.*8.388) and Aeneas himself (*cunctantem*, *A.* 12.940) to withstand the pressures of the pursuit of *fama* and of empire, Italy's own endeavour proves as ineffectual as the vain resistance of the golden bough (*cunctantem*, *A.*6.211); in all cases opposition is overcome, and overcome inevitably, by the forces of violence, passion, mindlessness and *furor*. The search for *fama* is not merely destructive; it is irresistible. Its cohorts are invincible.

Virgil's Pessimism

> corripit Aeneas extemplo auidusque refringit
> cunctantem.
>
> (*A.*6.210-11)
>
> Aeneas seizes at once and avidly breaks
> The resisting bough.

Despite the resistance of the golden bough, even though the bough does not come easily, but lingers, resists, in a sense warns Aeneas to interpose thought between desire and action, the Trojan hero plucks it straight away (*extemplo*, 210) and breaks it off eagerly (*auidusque refringit*, 210). Aeneas in fact acts unthinkingly, and the unthinking nature of his action is the more startling because more than any other character in the poem Aeneas is given to thought, reflection and inquiry.

Indeed in many senses Aeneas is Virgil's paradigm of a thoughtful, complexly perceptive consciousness. In Book 6 Aeneas is continually and emphatically portrayed as reflecting upon and wishing to reflect more upon the circumstances, actions and issues in which he is involved. The doors of the temple of Apollo (*A.*6.33ff.), the traumatic interview with the Sibyl (*A.*6.156ff.), the preparations for the funeral of Misenus (*A.*6.185ff.), the sight of the souls on the near side of the Styx (*A.*6.317ff., 382), the encounters with Palinurus (*A.*6.340ff.), Dido (*A.*6.455ff.), and Deiphobus (*A.*6.498ff., 537), the sounds of groaning and lashing arising from Tartarus (*A.*6.559ff.), the appearance of the tragic figure of the young Marcellus (*A.*6.860ff.) — all these provide occasion for reflection or inquiry or both on the part of Aeneas, and this even though attempts are constantly being made to distract him from thought, or at least to prevent him from carrying his potentiality for reflection too far. But perhaps the most important manifestation of the complexity of Aeneas' consciousness, of the awareness and perceptions of which he is capable, is the perplexity which the hero displays at the desire of souls to return to earthly life. When Aeneas sees the souls destined for reincarnation, his immediate reaction is one of uncomprehending bewilderment:

o pater, anne aliquas ad caelum hinc ire putandum est
sublimis animas iterumque ad tarda reuerti
corpora? quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido?

(*A.* 6.719-21)

O father, must it be thought some souls ascend from here
To the sky's vault and return once more to clogging
Bodies? What perverse desire for the light grips the wretches?

The longing of these souls to take their place once more on the earthly stage baffles and stuns the Trojan hero; it is a phenomenon which he is able to understand as little as the Sibyl can understand the 'perverse desire' (*dira cupido*, *A.* 6.373) of his faithful helmsman to be ferried across the Styx.[79] The Sibyl, conscious of the claims of history, was shocked by the intruding claims of the individual; Aeneas, conscious of the claims of the individual, is shocked by the intolerable necessity of history's cycle. As a result of his direct contact in the underworld with individual tragedy, loss and nullification, Aeneas has achieved such a penetrating, profoundly felt insight into the pain, the suffering, the futility of human life and the insufficiency of the compensation offered by the eternal name, that his view of earthly existence is one of unrelieved and unremitting anguish.[80] It is one of the poem's most tragic aspects that the insight which these lines display will fail to be embodied in Aeneas' future conduct, and fail to be embodied — at least in part — because of the compassion and humanity which define the insight itself.[81] The insight comes to fruition under the impact of Aeneas' personally felt encounters in the underworld, but comes to fruition only to be suppressed by a socio-moral dream and the attendant passion for greatness to come (*A.* 6.899). Like the souls destined for reincarnation as the heroes of Rome's future, Aeneas becomes *immemor*, is divested of all memory of the past, of all awarenesses to which the past and his experience of it gave rise, before emerging into the world of light.

[79] It cannot be accidental that the only other occurrence (apart from the two cited here) of the expression, *dira cupido*, in the *Aeneid* is in reference to the 'burning' desire for *fama* experienced by Nisus and Euryalus in Book 9 (*A.* 9.185). Their *dira cupido*, like that of the souls destined for reincarnation, involves the suspension of the intellect, that is to say, is indicative of a thoroughgoing mental blankness; and, like the soul's longing for the light (*lucis*, *A.* 6.721), the youths' desire for *fama* is for something dazzling but illusory (for the brightness-deception association, see the discussion of the ivory gate above). The use of one of the *Dirae* as Aeneas' auxiliary in his final victory (*A.* 12.845 ff. — see p. 106 above) may well be intended to reinforce the analogy between *Aeneas immemor* and the *animae immemores* and to draw the reader's attention to the *dira cupido* for glory (*famae uenientis amor*, *A.* 6.889) with which he is inflamed and by which he is being driven. The expression *dira cupido* also occurs at *G.* 1.37, where, as in the *Aeneid* passages, it is the perverseness of the desire in question which is underscored.

[80] *Cf.* H. Goelzer and A. Bellessort, *Virgile Énéide* (Paris 1925) *ad loc.*: 'Ce mot d'Énée est un des plus amers qui soient tombés d'une bouche humaine'. See also Segal [21] 45.

[81] See above p. 159.

Thus, although Book 6 of the *Aeneid* depicts Aeneas as the paradigm of a perceptive, meditative consciousness, the paradigm is a pessimistic one; for Virgil focusses the reader's attention not merely upon the quality of Aeneas' perceptions but also upon his failure, and upon the inevitability of his failure. Upon this inevitability of failure the present study closes.

In the *Aeneid* Virgil is concerned to express a belief in the tragic cycle of history. The ominous gifts snatched from the ruins of Troy (*Iliacis erepta ruinis*, *A.* 1.647; *cf. reliquias Troia ex ardente receptas*, 'relics taken from burning Troy', *A.* 7.244), which Aeneas presents to Dido in Book 1 (*A.* 1.647-55 — note especially the passing on of the mantle and veil of the fateful Helen) and to Latinus in Book 7 (*A.* 7.243-48 — note especially the handing over of the sceptre, diadem and robes of the ill-fated Priam),[82] the Sibyl's prophecy of the war in Latium (*A.* 6.86-97), which describes that war in terms of a recurrence of the Trojan war (and note that the significance of the Sibyl's prophecy is underlined by its juxtaposition with Aeneas' prayer for an end to his association with the fortunes of Troy [*A.* 6.62] and by Virgil's own echo of the Sibyl's speech in his proem to Books 7-12 — *horrida bella*, 'bristling wars', *A.* 6.86 and *A.* 7.41),[83] the golden bough which, when plucked, is always replaced by another which is identical (*A.* 6.143-44), the wheel of time which, when it has completed its cycle, sends the souls to the waters of Lethe that they may return to the world to make the same mistakes as before, since being *immemores* they cannot profit from the experiences of their past (*A.* 6.748-51; *cf. A.* 6.713-15) — these are some of the poem's more overt symbols of the tragic cycle of history; they indicate Virgil's belief in the inevitability of human failure — an inevitability due not to some metaphysic external to man but to man's own *natura immemor*, to an inability to learn from the environment which he experiences rooted in his own passional nature.

As with Corydon, Pasiphae and Gallus in the *Eclogues*, as with Leander and Orpheus in the *Georgics*, the interconnection between human failure and passionality is paramount:

> arma amens capio; nec sat rationis in armis,
> sed glomerare manum bello et concurrere in arcem
> cum sociis ardent animi; furor iraque mentem
> praecipitat, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.
>
> (*A.* 2.314-17)

> Mindless I snatch up arms; arms make little sense,
> But my spirits burn to gather a force for battle
> And rush to the citadel with my comrades; rage and anger
> Impel my mind; death in arms seems beautiful.

---

[82] Interesting comments on the ominous associations of 'gifts' in the *Aeneid* can be found in Hunt [61] 18-21. For further parallels between Dido and Latinus see Di Cesare [37] 135 ff.

[83] *Cf.* Anderson [47] 17.

Time and time again in the poem the vulnerability of the human psychology to events in the human environment, the repeatedly automatic, mindless nature of human response, behaviour, action, are dramatically presented. Man's subservience to potentially despotic passional forces in his psychology — sexual passion, ambition, greed, the drive for vengeance, power, wealth, fame —, his concomitant inability to resist the potentiality for violence and disorder in his own being, seem unambiguous. Pygmalion's sacrilegious slaughter of Sychaeus, blinded by love of gold (*A.* 1.348ff.), Coroebus' suicidal reaction when he sees the bound Cassandra (*A.* 2.407f.), Priam's senseless response to the sight of Troy being taken (*A.* 2.507ff.), Aeneas' irrational urge for vengeance when he encounters the fateful Helen (*A.* 2.575ff.), Dido's captivation by Aeneas as he tells his famous story (*A.* 4.1ff.), Aeneas' surrender after the Anchises' vision to the burning passion for fame (*A.* 6.889), the reaction of Amata to Aeneas' arrival in Latium and Latinus' promise of Lavinia to him (*A.* 7.373ff.), of Ascanius to the deer of the family of Tyrrhus (*A.* 7.493ff.), of Nisus and Euryalus to the sight of the sleeping Rutulians (*A.* 9.314ff.), of Pallas to his confrontation with Turnus (*A.* 10.449ff.), of Aeneas to the news of Pallas' death (*A.* 10.510ff.), of Mezentius to the news of Lausus' death (*A.* 10.843ff.), of Camilla to the glittering appearance of Cloreus (*A.* 11.778ff.), of Turnus to Lavinia's blushing beauty (*A.* 12.70ff.), of Aeneas to the sight of Pallas' gleaming belt in the final scene of the epic (*A.* 12.940ff.) — evidence the dominance of man's passional nature in determining action, behaviour, history, index the ineradicability of *furor*, the eternity of Juno's wound (*aeternum uulnus*, *A.* 1.36). The corollary: the repetitiveness of history, the inability of man to learn from experience, to apply the lessons of the past to the future as it is created.

Of this inability the *Aeneid*'s meditative hero is paradoxically the poem's prime illustration. In Book 6 constant references are made to Aeneas' Trojan past (e.g. *A.* 6.56ff., 83ff., 164ff., 481ff., 494ff., 838ff.), and epithets such as *Tros* (*A.* 6.52, 126), *Dardanius* (*A.* 6.169), *Troius* (*A.* 6.403, 451), used of Aeneas in this book (*cf.* also Deiphobus' injunction, *i, decus, i, nostrum*, 'Go, our renown, go', *A.* 6.546, and the Sibyl's address, *dux inclute Teucrum*, 'Renowned leader of the Trojans', *A.* 6.562), serve to link Aeneas with that past. These epithets are, however, still applied to Aeneas later on in the poem, particularly in connection with his conduct of the war in Books 10-12 (e.g. *A.* 10.250, 545, 584, 598, 603, 814, 886; *A.* 11.125, 400, 472; *A.* 12.14, 456, 502, 723, 775); and they are applied in a way which reveals that he has learnt nothing from his past, in a way which emphasises the recurrence in his behaviour of the same wanton violence which he and others had displayed at the fall of Troy,[84] and

[84] See p. 94 and 111 n. 50 above. Anderson's comment [47] 29 that 'it would contradict the tendency of the Trojan theme in I-V to show Aeneas once again playing the role in which we saw

anticipates the climactic resurgence in the poem's final lines (*A*. 12.946f.) of the initial *ira* and *furor* manifested by him (*A*.2.316f.). Indeed in Books 7-12 (esp. *A*. 12) Virgil uses thematic and verbal parallelism, a pattern of allusions to Homer, and a most suggestive constellation of imagery in such a way as to direct the reader to look upon Aeneas' conquest of Italy as a repetition of the murderous *furor* exhibited by Achilles' son, Pyrrhus, at Troy, and a mimesis of the pitiless and wasteful carnage perpetrated by *saeuus Achilles* himself — a mimesis in fact of the very carnage which ironically in its pictorial form on the temple built by Dido had drawn from Aeneas a profoundly compassionate response.[85]

Not that Aeneas' failure to learn from the past is simply the product of a passional nature common to all men. One of the despairing ironies of the *Aeneid*, underscoring the notion of the inevitability of human failure, is that the exceptional sensibility which its hero possesses — compassionate and humane — and the capacity for reflection which attends it, far from preventing experiential and moral amnesia, contribute towards them by making Aeneas' surrender to the socio-moral vision of Rome's future and to the accompanying passion for *fama* psychologically inevitable.[86] Product in part of a profound and humane sensibility, Aeneas' Romanisation yet generates the experiential and moral blindness characteristic of passional man:

talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis,
miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet
attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum.

(*A*.8.729-31)

At such scenes on Vulcan's shield, his mother's gift,
He marvels and ignorant of things delights in the image,
Lifting on his shoulder his descendant's fame and fate.

At Anchises' apocalypse Aeneas marvelled (*mirantibus*, *A*.6.854) but did not delight.[87] Here Romanised Aeneas, who has visited the Arcadian-Saturnian site of Rome and now accepts the burden of its history, here Romanised Aeneas (and that his Romanisation is finally complete is dramatically signified by the embrace which his mother Venus, the divine embodiment of Rome, seeks with him for the first time, *A*.8.615)[88] both marvels at and delights in the representation of Rome's future, just as he had both marvelled (*miratur*,

---

him in II' seems to reveal a fundamental misunderstanding not only of the function of the Trojan theme itself, but also of Aeneas' conduct in the second half of the poem.

[85] See pp. 102f., 154-56 above. The cyclical movement is observed also by J. P. Poe, 'Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas', *TAPA* 96 (1965) 334.

[86] See above p. 159.

[87] The parallels between the 'revelation' scenes at the ends of Books 6 and 8 are important (see above p. 86 n. 2). So also are the differences.

[88] Contrast Venus' avoidance of her son's embrace at *A*. 1.402-9.

A. 8.619) and delighted (*laetus, A.* 8.617) a few moments earlier when the arms were presented to him. But he marvels and delights in ignorance, *rerum ignarus*[89] — an ignorance which, as the beginning of Book 10 underlines (*ignarus, A.* 10.25, 85 [*bis*], 228; *inscius, A.* 10.249), characterises, if not defines, the Romanised hero's psychology. Precise, the semantic ambiguity of *rerum ignarus* arrests. The primary connotation, 'ignorant of future events', is clearly important, since it suggests that it is *because* Aeneas is ignorant of the true nature of the course of Roman history that he rejoices in its ideological image on the shield.[90] It is, however, the secondary sense which interests most — *rerum ignarus*, 'ignorant of things', 'ignorant of reality', 'ignorant of the way the world works'. It is this ignorance of reality, this blindness to the moral and experiential actualities of human life, psychological bed-fellow of the passion for *fama*, which perhaps more than anything else is basis of the delight Aeneas feels at the portrayal of Rome's future, and (more importantly) is basis of his ill-fated attempt to realise empire's vision. Product in part of Aeneas' exceptional sensibility, pointer to his failure to learn from experience, it draws attention to the inability of profound reflection and compassionate humanity to break the tragic cycle.

Not even works of art and their evaluative ordering of experience alleviate this adamantine pessimism. From the shield, from the Carthaginian frescoes, from the Daedalus engravings, and from the experiences of his past as a whole, Aeneas learns essentially nothing. What insight and understanding he displays in the poem (as, for example, in Books 1 and 6) prove transitory, evanescent, fail ultimately to be embodied in action. Ignorant of what is happening and what is likely to happen, blind to the non-realisability of empire's ideology, oblivious of the disparity between the value of *fama* and the cost in terms of human nullification which it exacts, Aeneas in the second half of the epic, a deluded and deluding hero, ignoring both his own experience and the

[89] Although it is of course possible to construe *rerum* with either *ignarus* or *imagine*, or (preferably) with both, the word-order dictates that the primary construction is *rerum ignarus* — despite J. Conington and H. Nettleship, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Vol. III[3] (London 1883) *ad loc.*

[90] For *res Romanae*, unlike the *imago*, will give no cause for joy. *Cf.* Dudley [37] 60. Not that the *imago* is unequivocally ideological. Aspects of the shield's depiction seem to provide latent questioning of its overt ideology. Note, e.g., the reference to the immoral (*sine more*) Sabine rape (*A.* 8.635), the horrific description of the death of Mettus (*A.* 8.642-45), the sinister portrayal of Augustus (*A.* 8.678-81: note esp. the fire imagery, and the 'serpent' epithet *geminas*; *cf.* the *geminos anguis* that await Cleopatra *A.* 8.697, and the fiery arrival of Aeneas at the scene of battle in Book 10.260-75), and the sympathetic tableau of the defeated Cleopatra (*A.* 8.709-13: note its thematic and verbal parallelism with the fate of the tragic Dido — *cf. A.* 8.709 with *A.* 4.644). Nor is the fact that the maker of the shield is the 'Fire-Lord' (*ignipotens, A.* 8.414, 423, 628, 710, *A.* 10.243) without implication. A sinister shadow is of course cast on the shield earlier in Book 8 (*A.* 8.370 ff.) by Venus' guileful seduction of Vulcan with its overtones of 'brutal sex-and-violence': see Di Cesare [37] 149-54. On ambivalence in the shield, especially in the Actium scene, see Gillis [44] 134 ff.

representation of that experience in art, resurrects the very past from which he is fleeing, engenders an environment which accelerates his own dehumanisation, and ensures the victory of the forces of violence and non-reason which it was his ideological commitment to oppose.[91]

> We do not know very much of the future

wrote Eliot

> Except that from generation to generation
> The same things happen again and again.
> Men learn little from others' experience.
> (*Murder in the Cathedral*, Part 1, 282-85)

Virgil would add: 'Or from their own'. In Aeneas' catastrophic pursuit of *fama* is instantiated the failure of *all* experience to teach. A fitting ancestor for *Troianus Caesar* (*A.* 1.286), *Troius Aeneas* proves emblem not merely of Roman man.

Nor can the gods be blamed. To Nisus' disquieting question on the burning drive for glory —

> dine hunc ardorem mentibus addunt,
> Euryale, an sua cuique deus fit dira cupido?
> (*A.* 9.184-85)

> Do gods place this burning in our minds, Euryalus,
> Or does each make a god of his own perverse desire?

— the youths' bloody self-destruction provides answer. Virgil's use of the preternatural in the *Aeneid* has the effect of underscoring the determinism of history (*ineluctabile fatum*, *A.* 8.334), presenting the spectacle of human beings in the grip of forces beyond their control;[92] but, as the poet's insistence on the personal motivation of his characters makes clear,[93] the irresistible forces which govern their lives are but the thinly disguised monsters of their own psychology.[94] Man's responsibility for history is as emphatic —

---

[91] Contrast R. A. Hornsby, *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid* (Iowa City 1970) 76: 'Aeneas, who starts his career in darkness and rage, becomes the paradigm of the man who learns to know himself and to live in accord with that knowledge'.

[92] *Cf.* W. A. Camps, *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1969) 45 ff.

[93] See, e.g., L. A. Mackay, 'Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*', *TAPA* 94 (1963) 163: 'The divine machinery of the *Aeneid* not only seems, but is, imposed on an otherwise already adequate human motivation'. *Cf.* also Duckworth [56] 358.

[94] Amata's *furor* over Aeneas' arrival and the actions to which this gives rise (*A.* 7.341 ff.) are an obvious example. Note how Virgil is keen to draw attention to Amata's own psychological motivation (*A.* 7.344-45) at the very same time as he presents her as a victim of Allecto (*A.* 7.345 ff.). Amata's course of conduct is both (a) in accord with her own personal response and motives and (b) forced upon her. She cannot help what she does; but what she does is the product of her own psychological response to the circumstances which confront her. Contrast Williams [7]

sua cuique exorsa laborem
fortunamque ferent.

(*A*. 10.111-12)

To each shall his own actions
Bring toil or fortune.

— as history's determinism, history's inevitable and tragic cycle: *fata uiam inuenient* ('the fates will find their way', *A*. 10.113). Ineluctable, Aeneas' inability to profit from his experience is the product of his own human nature, his status as *mortalis aeger* (*G*. 1.237, *A*. 2.268, *A*. 10.274, *A*. 12.850), and Book 6 of the *Aeneid* on one level at least has to be viewed in terms of a struggle within Aeneas' own mind,[95] a struggle which ends with the acerbic conclusion that, since even the paradigm of a thoughtful, complexly perceptive consciousness is doomed to failure and doomed to failure because of itself, the inevitability of man's failure is assured. As is the failure of art.

Virgilian intertextuality confirms the augmented pessimism. The tragic devastation of *Georgic* 4's civic paradigm in *Aeneid* 1-4 and 12 (*cf.* esp. *A*. 1.430-36 and *G*. 4.162-69; *A*. 12.587-92), the ruinous mendacity of transformed pastoral and georgic ideals (even the 'golden age' itself: *A*. 6.791ff.) in *Aeneid* 6 and 8, the exhibited destruction of a Saturnian kingdom and an Arcadian-Saturnian world (*cf.* esp. *A*. 7.45ff, *A*. 8.102-584, *A*. 11.139-81; *E*. 4, *E*. 10; *G*. 2.173ff.) in *Aeneid* 7-12, the whole *Aeneid*'s presentation of art's failure and man's inability to learn (*cf.* *E*. 2, *E*. 3, *E*. 9, *E*. 10; *G*. 4) — index the collapse of earlier (qualified) idealism, so doing underscore the abandonment of poetic and moral hope. It is no accident that the failure of *labor* and victory of *furor* demonstrated in the epic's final scene echo Orpheus' failure at the end of the *Georgics* and that of Gallus at the *Eclogues*' close. Aeneas, Orpheus and Gallus index the truth. Nor seems it accident either that the final line of Virgil's final text —

uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

(*A*. 12.952)

With a groan life protesting flees beneath the shadows.

echoes the 'shadows' that close his first:

surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.

(*E*. 10.75f.)

20ff., who interprets the gods in the *Aeneid* as (in part) 'tropes for human motivation' but sees no determinism in the poem.

[95] *Cf.* Otis [4] 167: 'the book's central concern [is] with Aeneas and the spiritual processes at work in his psyche'. See also *id.* [2] 306-12, Mackay [2] 184, Williams [6] 48, and Segal [21] 61.

Let us rise; shade is oppressive to singers;
Juniper's shade's oppressive; crops too are stunted by shadows.

Echoes too the 'shadows' that begin (*in umbra*, *E.* 1.4) and end (*umbrae*, *E.* 1.83) that text's first poem. Returning to the spiritual landscape of the *Eclogues*, in which ideal and reality are dissident, the poetic voice apparently nullified, the social and moral order subverted by political dissolution and force, Virgil not only recalls earlier scepticism and indicates the holistic nature of his *œuvre*; he signals the echoic Muse's triumph,[96] the cyclic futility of his own poetic life. He prophesies the failure of the *Aeneid.*

The prophecy was already implied. The *Aeneid*'s failure was a condition of its truth. Itself an evaluative ordering of experience in art and a critical reminder of man's errors in history, in order for its thesis about art's impotence and human failure to be substantiated, it had, like the pictures on Dido's temple in Book 1, like the doors fashioned by Daedalus in Book 6, like the shield made by Vulcan in Book 8, to be either ignored or not understood. It hardly needs saying that this is largely what happened. Like the works of art it entexts and the *œuvre* to which it is bound, the *Aeneid* is a cogent illustration of the uselessness of the artist's perceptions. *Pictura inanis* (*A.* 1.464), *effusus labor* (*G.* 4.492), *studium inane* (*E.* 2.5), Virgil's epic vision reveals itself, as two thousand years attest, essentially the self-reflexive poiesis of Rome's Chaonian dove. The spear and the eagle prevailed.

---

[96] See pp. 12f., 33-35, 34 n. 46, 82.

APPENDIX

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

All dates are B.C.

106	Birth of Pompey and Cicero.
100	Sixth consulate of Marius. Birth of Julius Caesar. *Ca.* 100: publication of Meleager's *Garland.*
ca. 97	Birth of Lucretius.
91-89	Social or Marsic War: Rome v. Italian Allies.
89-85	First Mithridatic War.
88	Sulla's march on Rome. Flight of Marius.
88-83	Sulla in the east.
86	Seventh consulate and death of Marius. Athens sacked by Sulla. Mithridates defeated.
ca. 84	Birth of Catullus.
83-82	Civil War.
82-79	Dictatorship of Sulla.
73-71	Slave-revolt of Spartacus. Crushed by Crassus and Pompey.
70	First consulate of Pompey and Crassus. Birth of Virgil (Oct. 15) at Andes near Mantua. *Ca.* 70: arrival at Rome of the Callimachean Parthenius of Nicaea.
ca. 69	Birth of Gallus.
67	Defeat of pirates by Pompey.
66	*Lex Manilia* confers on Pompey the command against Mithridates.
66-63	Pompey in the east.
65	Birth of Horace at Venusia.
63	Consulate of Cicero. Catilinarian conspiracy. Pompey's settlement of the east. Birth of Octavian, later Augustus (63 B.C.-A.D. 14).
60	Formation of first triumvirate: Caesar, Pompey, Crassus.
59	First consulate of Caesar. Birth of Livy at Padua.
58-49	Caesar in Gaul.
56	Conference at Luca: triumvirate renewed.
55	Second consulate of Pompey and Crassus. *Ca.* 55: birth of Tibullus.
54	Crassus sets out for Parthia. Death of Julia, Caesar's daughter and Pompey's wife. *Ca.* 54: deaths of Catullus and Lucretius; publication of *De Rerum Natura.* Birth of Livy.
53	Crassus killed at Carrhae in Parthia. Loss of legionary standards.
52	Third consulate of Pompey.
52-50	Tension between Pompey and Caesar moves Rome to brink of civil war. Publication of Caesar's *Gallic Wars.*
ca. 50	Birth of Propertius.
49	Caesar crosses the Rubicon (Jan. 11) and drives Pompey out of Italy.
49-45	Civil War.
48	Second consulate of Caesar. Battle of Pharsalus (Thessaly). Pompey killed in Egypt.
47	Caesar declared dictator *in absentia.*

46 Third consulate of Caesar. Defeat of Pompeians in Africa. Suicide of Cato at Utica.

46-44 Dictatorship of Caesar. Publication of Caesar's *Civil Wars*.

44 Fifth consulate and assassination (March 15) of Caesar. By his will Octavian adopted. First consulate of Antony.

43 First consulate of Octavian. Formation of second triumvirate: Antony, Octavian, Lepidus. Proscriptions: death of Cicero. Birth of Ovid at Sulmona.

42 Consulate of Lepidus (2nd) and Plancus. Deification of Julius Caesar (Jan. 1). Battle of Philippi: Brutus and Cassius defeated by Antony and Octavian.

42-38 Composition of Virgil's *Eclogues*; also Gallus *Amores* (*ca.* 40), Sallust *Catiline* and *Jugurtha*.

41 Land-confiscations in Italy (including land around Cremona) for 100,000 veterans of Antony's and Octavian's disbanded legions.

41-40 Perusine War. Antony's wife, Fulvia, and his brother, Lucius Antonius, v. Octavian.

40 Consulate of Asinius Pollio. Treaty of Brundisium, negotiated by Pollio and Maecenas. Reconciliation of Antony and Octavian. Antony marries Octavia.

39 Pollio victorious in Illyricum.

39-36 War with Sextus Pompey.

37 First consulate of Agrippa. Treaty of Tarentum: triumvirate renewed.

37-29 Composition of Virgil's *Georgics*; also Varro *Res Rusticae* (37), Horace *Epodes* and *Satires* 1 and 2, Sallust *Histories*, Nepos *De Viris Illustribus*.

36 Defeat of Sextus Pompey. Victories to Agrippa at Mylae and Naulochus. Lepidus deposed.

36-32 Antony in the east. Marries Cleopatra. Divorces Octavia (32).

34 Second consulate of Antony.

33 Second consulate of Octavian.

32 Plancus deserts Antony for Octavian. Italian oath of allegiance to Octavian. War declared on Cleopatra. Pollio neutral.

31 Third consulate of Octavian. Battle of Actium (Sept. 2): Antony and Cleopatra defeated by Octavian's fleet under Agrippa.

30 Fourth consulate of Octavian. Deaths of Antony and Cleopatra. Annexation of Egypt. Gallus made first imperial prefect of Egypt. Conspiracy of Lepidus, son of triumvir, to assassinate Octavian, detected by Maecenas.

29 Fifth consulate of Octavian. Temple of Janus closed. Octavian celebrates triple triumph (Aug. 13-15) for victories in Illyricum, at Actium and Alexandria. *Georgics* (dedicated to Maecenas: *G.* 1.2, 2.41, 3.41, 4.2) read to Octavian at Atella (Suetonius-Donatus *Vita* 27). Inauguration of temple of *Diuus Iulius*.

29-19 Composition of Virgil's *Aeneid*; also Varius *Thyestes*, Propertius *Elegies* 1-3, Tibullus *Elegies* 1 and 2, Horace *Odes* 1-3 and *Epistles* 1, Ovid *Amores*, Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 1-5.

28 Sixth consulate of Octavian and second consulate of Agrippa. *Ca.* 28: Gallus recalled in disfavour to Rome.

27 Seventh consulate of Octavian and third consulate of Agrippa. First 'Augustan Settlement': Octavian 'transfers' Republic to Senate (Jan. 13); given proconsular power over Spain, Gaul and Syria (plus continuing consulships). Receives (Jan. 16) title of Augustus (on motion of Plancus); laurel wreath placed over his doorway; golden shield presented to him in recognition of his *uirtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas*. Death of Varro.

27-24 Augustus in Spain.

26 Eighth consulate of Augustus. Suicide of Gallus.

23 Eleventh consulate of Augustus and consulate of Murena. Conspiracy of Caepio and Murena against Augustus. Their execution. Augustus' near-fatal illness. Signet-ring handed to Agrippa. Second 'Augustan Settlement': Augustus resigns consulship; given universal proconsular *imperium* and tribunician power. Death of Marcellus at Baiae.

19 Suetonius-Donatus *Vita* (35-41): Virgil leaves Italy for Greece and Asia Minor intending to spend three years revising the *Aeneid*, after which he is to devote himself to philosophy. At Athens he meets Augustus and decides to return with him. He is taken ill at Megara, and dies at Brundisium (Brindisi) on Sept. 21. Before leaving Italy he had asked Varius, to whom with Tucca he left his writings, to burn the *Aeneid* should anything happen to him. On Augustus' instructions the request is disregarded and the *Aeneid* published.

LIST OF MODERN WORKS CITED

Altevogt H., *Labor Improbus: Eine Vergilstudie* (Münster 1952).
Anderson W. S., *The Art of the Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1969).
—, 'Vergil's Second Iliad', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 17-30.
Arrowsmith W., Foreword to Merwin and Dimock (below) v-xiii.
Austin R. G. (ed.) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford 1971).
—, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Oxford 1955).
—, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford 1977).
Barchiesi A. (ed.), *Virgilio Georgiche* (Milan 1980).
Barthes R., *Essais Critiques* (Paris 1964).
—, *S/Z* (Paris 1970).
Beare R., 'Invidious Success: Some Thoughts on the End of the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 5 (1964-65) 18-30.
Berg W., *Early Virgil* (London 1974).
Bowra C. M., 'Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal', *G&R* 3 (1933-34) 8-21.
—, *From Virgil to Milton* (London 1945).
Boyle A. J. (ed.), *Ancient Pastoral: Ramus Essays on Greek and Roman Pastoral Poetry* (Berwick, Victoria 1975).
—, (ed. and trans.), *The Eclogues of Virgil* (Melbourne 1976).
—, (ed.) *Virgil's Ascraean Song: Ramus Essays on the Georgics* (Berwick, Victoria 1979).
—, 'Virgil's Pastoral Echo', *Ramus* 6 (1977) 121-31.
Bradley A. 'Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative: Vergil's *Georgics*', *Arion* 8 (1969) 347-58.
Bray J. J., 'The Ivory Gate', in Kelly (below) 55-69.
Brooks R. A., '*Discolor Aura*: Reflections on the Golden Bough', *AJP* 74 (1953) 260-80. Reprinted in Commager (below) 143-63.
Burck E., 'Die Komposition von Vergils Georgika', *Hermes* 64 (1929) 279-321.
Camps W. A., *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1969).
—, 'The Role of the Sixth Book in the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 7 (1967-68) 22-30.
Cartault A., *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide* (Paris 1926).
—, *Études sur les Bucoliques de Vergile* (Paris 1897).
Clausen W., 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry', *GRBS* 5 (1964) 181-96.
—, 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 68 (1964) 139-47. Reprinted in Commager (below) 75-88.
Coleman R., 'Pastoral Poetry' in Higginbotham (below) 100-23.
—, (ed.) *Vergil: Eclogues* (Cambridge 1977).
Commager S., (ed.) *Virgil: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1966).
Comparetti D., *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, trans. E. F. M. Benecke (2nd edn. London 1908). Reprinted London 1966.
Conington J. and Nettleship H., (edd.) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Vol. I 4th edn. London 1881; Vol II 3rd edn. London 1876; Vol. III 2nd edn. London 1875).
Conte G. B., 'Introduzione' in Barchiesi (above) vii-xxi.
Conway R. S., 'The Architecture of the Epic', in *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1928) 129-49.
Dahlmann H., 'Der Bienenstaat in Vergils Georgica', *Akad. der Wiss. Mainz, Abhand. Geistes und Sozialwiss. Klasse* (1954) No. 10, 547-62.
Damon P., 'Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse', *UCPCP* 15 (1961) 261-334.
Davis P. J. 'Vergil's *Georgics* and the Pastoral Ideal', in Boyle 1979 (above) 22-33.
Derrida J., *De la grammatologie* (Paris 1967).
Desport M., 'L'écho de la nature et de la poésie dans les Églogues de Virgile', *REA* 43 (1941) 270-81.
Di Cesare M. A., *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's Aeneid* (New York and London 1974).

Dodds E. R., *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951).
Duckworth G. E., 'The Architecture of the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 75 (1954) 1-15.
—, 'Fate and Free Will in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CJ* 51 (1955-56) 357-64.
Dudley D. R., 'A Plea for Aeneas', *G&R* n.s. 8 (1961) 52-60.
—, (ed.) *Virgil* (London 1969).
—, 'Virgil' in Dudley and Lang (below) 172-74.
Dudley D. R. and Lang D. M., *The Penguin Companion to Literature IV* (Harmondsworth 1969).
Du Quesnay I. M., Review in *G&R* n.s. 28 (1981) 95-100.
Dyer R. R., 'Ambition in the *Georgics*: Vergil's Rejection of Arcadia', in Harris (below) 143-64.
Eichholz D. E., 'Symbol and Contrast in the *Aeneid*', *G&R* n.s. 15 (1968) 105-12.
Elder J. P., '*Non iniussa cano*: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue', *HSCP* 65 (1961) 109-25.
Eliot T. S., *Selected Essays* (London 1951).
Enk P. J., 'De labyrinthi imagine in foribus templi Cumani insculpta (Vergilii Aen. VI 27)', *Mnemosyne* (ser. 4) 11 (1958) 322-30.
Feder L., 'Vergil's Tragic Theme' *CJ* 49 (1953-54) 197-209.
Fenik B., 'Parallelism of Theme and Imagery in *Aeneid* II and IV', *AJP* 80 (1959) 1-24.
Fletcher F., (ed.) *Virgil Aeneid VI* (Oxford 1941).
Fowler W. Warde., *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (London 1911).
Fraenkel E., 'Some Aspects of the Structure of *Aeneid* VII', *JRS* 35 (1945) 1-14.
Galinsky G. K., 'Vergil's Second *Eclogue*: Its Theme and Relation to the *Eclogue* Book', *C&M* 26 (1965) 161-91.
Geymonat M., (ed.) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin 1973).
Gillis D., *Eros and Death in the Aeneid* (Rome 1983).
Goelzer H. and Bellesort A., (edd.) *Virgile Énéide* (Paris 1925).
Gransden K. W., (ed.) *Virgil: Aeneid Book VIII* (Cambridge 1976).
Graves R., *Oxford Addresses on Poetry* (London 1962).
Griffin J., 'The Fourth *Georgic*, Virgil, and Rome', *G&R* n.s. 26 (1979) 61-80.
—, Review Article, 'Haec Super Aruorum Cultu', *CR* n.s. 31 (1981) 23-37.
Griffiths C., 'Myricae', *PVS* 9 (1969-70) 1-19a.
Harris B. F., (ed.) *Auckland Classical Essays Presented to E.M. Blaiklock* (Auckland 1971).
Heinze R. *Virgils Epische Technik* (3rd edn. Leipzig and Berlin 1915).
Henry J., *Aeneidea* (London and Dublin 1873-79).
Higginbotham J., (ed.) *Greek and Latin Literature: A Comparative Study* (London 1969).
Hirsch E. D. Jr., *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago and London 1976).
—, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven and London 1967).
Hornsby R. A., *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid* (Iowa City 1970).
Hunt J. W., *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1973).
Johnson W. R., 'Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*', *CJ* 60 (1965) 360-64.
—, 'The Broken World: Virgil and his Augustus', *Arethusa* 14 (1981) 49-55.
—, *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1976).
Kelly M., (ed.) *For Service to Classical Studies: Essays in Honour of Francis Letters* (Melbourne 1966).
Kenney E. J., 'Books and Readers in the Roman World', in Kenney and Clausen (below) 3-32.
Kenney E. J. and Clausen W., (edd.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1982).
Kinsley J., (ed.) *The Poems of John Dryden* (Oxford 1958).
Klingner F., *Virgil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* (Zürich 1967).
—, *Virgils Georgica* (Zürich and Stuttgart 1963).
Knight W. F. J., *Cumaean Gates* (Oxford 1936).
—, *Roman Vergil* (London 1944). Reprinted Harmondsworth 1966.
Knox B. M., 'The Serpent and the Flame : the Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 71 (1950) 379-400. Reprinted in Commager (above) 124-42.
Kresic S., 'Le rameau d'or chez Virgile', *EMC* 12 (1968) 92-102.
La Penna A., 'Esiodo nella cultura e nella poesia di Virgilio', *Fondation Hardt Entretiens* 7 (1960) 213-52.

Lawall G., *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book* (Washington D.C. 1967).
Leach E.W., '*Georgics* 2 and the Poem', *Arethusa* 14 (1981) 35-48.
—, '*Sedes Apibus*: From the *Georgics* to the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 23 (1977) 2-16.
—, *Vergil's Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience* (Ithaca and London 1974).
Leavis F. R., *Nor Shall My Sword* (London 1972).
Lennox P.G., 'Virgil's Night-Episode Re-examined (*Aeneid* ix. 176-449)', *Hermes* 105 (1977) 331-42.
Levick B., 'Primus, Murena and *Fides*: Notes on Cassius Dio liv. 3', *G&R* n.s. 22 (1975) 156-63.
Lewis C. Day., (trans.) *The Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil* (Oxford 1966).
Liebeschuetz W., 'Beast and Man in the Third Book of Virgil's *Georgics*', *G&R* n.s. 12 (1965) 64-77.
Little D.A., 'The Death of Turnus and the Pessimism of the *Aeneid*', *Aumla* 33 (1970) 67-76.
Lyne R.O.A.M., '*Scilicet et tempus ueniet* ... Virgil, *Georgics* 1.463-514', in Woodman and West (below) 47-66.
MacKay L.A., 'Achilles as Model for Aeneas', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 11-16.
—, 'Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*', *TAPA* 94 (1963) 157-66.
—, Three Levels of Meaning in *Aeneid* VI', *TAPA* 86 (1955) 180-89.
Marx L., 'Two Kingdoms of Force', *Massachusetts Review* 1 (1959) 62-95.
Mazzali E., (ed.) *Torquato Tasso Prose* (Milan/Naples 1959).
McKay A.G., *Vergil's Italy* (Bath 1970).
Merwin W.S. and Dimock G.E. Jr., (trans.) *Euripides: Iphigenia at Aulis* (Oxford 1978).
Miles G.B., '*Georgics* 3.209-294: *Amor* and Civilization', *CSCA* 8 (1975) 177-97.
—, *Virgil's Georgics*: *A New Interpretation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1980).
Mountford J., 'The Architecture of the *Georgics*', *PVS* 6 (1966-67) 25-34.
Muecke F., 'Virgil and the Genre of Pastoral', *Aumla* 44 (1975) 169-80.
Mynors R.A.B., (ed.) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford 1969). Reprinted with corrections Oxford 1972.
Nethercut W.R., 'Invasion in the *Aeneid*', *G&R* n.s. 15 (1968) 82-95.
—, 'Vergil's *De Rerum Natura*', *Ramus* 2 (1973) 41-52.
Newton F.L., 'Recurrent Imagery in *Aeneid* IV', *TAPA* 88 (1957) 31-43.
Norden E., (ed.) *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (3rd edn. Stuttgart 1927).
Northrup M.D., 'Like Dreams That Delude the Sleeping Senses: Aeneas' Moral Failure and Vergil's Imagery of the Insubstantial', *Ramus* 7 (1978) 26-37.
Orlin L.L., (ed.) *Janus: Essays in Ancient and Modern Studies* (Ann Arbor 1975).
Otis B., 'A New Study of the *Georgics*', *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 40-62.
—, 'Three Problems of *Aeneid* 6', *TAPA* 90 (1959) 165-79.
—, 'Virgil and Clio', *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 59-75.
—, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964).
Page T.E., (ed.) *Virgil: Aeneid I-VI* (London 1894).
—, (ed.) *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII* (London 1900).
—, (ed.) *Virgil: Bucolics and Georgics* (London 1898).
Parry A., 'The Idea of Art in Virgil's *Georgics*', *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 35-52.
—, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2.4 (1963) 66-80. Reprinted in Commager (above) 107-23.
Perkell C.G., 'A Reading of Virgil's Fourth Georgic', *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 211-21.
Poe J.P., 'Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas', *TAPA* 96 (1965) 321-36.
Pope H., 'Vergil's *Picturae Inanes*: A Study of the Ekphraseis of the *Aeneid*', Ph.D. Diss. Monash (1974).
Pöschl V., *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Innsbruck 1950; 2nd edn. Vienna 1964). 1st edn. trans. By G. Seligson, *The Art of Virgil* (Ann Arbor 1962).
Prescott H.W., *The Development of Virgil's Art* (Chicago 1927). Reprinted New York 1963.
Putnam M.C.J., '*Aeneid* 7 and the *Aeneid*', *AJP* 91 (1970) 408-30.
—, 'Italian Virgil and the Idea of Rome', in Orlin (above) 171-99.
—, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass. 1966).
—, Review of G. Williams (below), *AJP* 105 (1984) 228-31.

—, *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues* (Princeton 1970).
—, *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the Georgics* (Princeton 1979).
Quinn K., *Latin Explorations* (London 1963).
—, 'Some Dying Words: Tragic Insight in the *Aeneid* and the Question of Virgil's Competence', *Aumla* 22 (1964) 178-90.
—, *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description* (London 1968).
Reckford K.J., 'Latent Tragedy in *Aeneid* VII. 1-285', *AJP* 82 (1961) 252-69.
Richter W., (ed.) *Vergil, Georgica* (München 1957).
Robbe-Grillet A., Article in *Le Nouvel Observateur* (Paris) 26 June 1970.
Ross D.O. Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge 1975).
Rudd N., *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1976).
Scullard H., *From the Gracchi to Nero* (London 1959; 2nd edn. London 1963).
Segal C.P., '*Aeternum per saecula nomen*, The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History', *Arion* 4 (1965) 617-57, *Arion* 5 (1966) 34-72.
—, 'The Hesitation of the Golden Bough: A Reexamination', *Hermes* 96 (1968-69) 74-79.
—, 'The Magic of Orpheus and the Ambiguities of Language', *Ramus* 7 (1978) 106-42.
—, 'Orpheus and the fourth Georgic: Vergil on Nature and Civilization', *AJP* 87 (1966) 307-25.
—, '*Tamen cantabitis, Arcades*: Exile and Arcadia in Eclogues One and Nine', *Arion* 4 (1965) 237-66.
—, '*Vergil's Caelatum Opus*: An Interpretation of the Third *Eclogue*' *AJP* 88 (1967) 279-308.
—, 'Vergil's Sixth Eclogue and the Problem of Evil', *TAPA* 100 (1969) 407-35.
Sellar W.Y., *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil* (3rd edn. Oxford 1897).
Snell B., *The Discovery of the Mind*, trans. T.G. Rosenmeyer (Cambridge, Mass. 1953). Reprinted New York 1960.
Stehle E., 'Virgil's *Georgics*: The Threat of Sloth', *TAPA* 104 (1974) 347-69.
Stewart Z., 'The Song of Silenus', *HSCP* 64 (1959) 179-205.
Syme R., *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939; 2nd edn. Oxford 1952).
Thornton A.H., 'The Last Scene of the *Aeneid*', *G&R* 22 (1953) 82-84.
Van Sickle J., 'Studies of Dialectical Methodology in the Virgilian Tradition', *MLN* 85 (1970) 884-928.
—, 'The Unnamed Child: A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue', *HSCP* 71 (1966) 349-52.
Wender D.S., 'Resurrection in the Fourth *Georgic*', *AJP* 90 (1969) 424-36.
Whitfield J.H., 'Virgil into Dante', in Dudley 1969 (above) 94-118.
Wilkinson L.P., *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey* (Cambridge 1969).
—, 'The Intention of Virgil's *Georgics*', *G&R* 19 (1950) 19-28.
—, 'Pindar and the Proem to the Third Georgic', in Wimmel (below) 286-90.
Williams G., *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven and London 1983).
Williams R.D., (ed.) *The Aeneid of Virgil* (2 vols. Basingstoke and London 1972-73).
—, 'Changing Attitudes to Virgil' in Dudley 1969 (above) 119-38.
—, *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (Sydney 1977).
—, 'The Opening Scenes of the *Aeneid*', *PVS* 5 (1965-66) 14-23.
—, (ed.) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus* (Oxford 1960).
—, 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*', *Antichthon* 1 (1967) 29-41.
—, 'Servius — Commentator and Guide', *PVS* 6 (1966-67) 50-60.
—, 'The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*', *G&R* n.s. 11 (1964) 48-63.
—, 'Virgil and the *Odyssey*', *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 266-74.
Wimmel W. (ed.) *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur* (Wiesbaden 1970).
Woodman T. and West D., (edd.) *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1974).
Wormell D.E.W., 'The Originality of the *Eclogues*' in Dudley 1969 (above) 1-26.
Zarker J.W., 'Aeneas and Theseus in *Aeneid* 6', *CJ* 62 (1967) 220-26.

GENERAL INDEX

Note: With the exception of those cited in Chapter I, modern scholars are not listed in this index. Full details of modern works referred to in the notes to Chapters II-V may be found in the bibliography on pp. 180-83.

Accius, 6
Achates, 112
Achilles, 24 n. 23, 102, 103, 154-56, 172
Actium, 6, 41, 44, 79, 93, 145, 165
Aegaeon, 93
Aeneas, 7, 33, 73, 86, 88f., 91-175; analogy with Augustus, 7, 93 and n. 16, 98 n. 23, 107, 174; character of, 133f., 152, 156, 168-70, 172, 175; confrontation with past, 134f., 137-39, 150; and Dido, 115-20, 152; discrepancy between word and action, 96, 99, 107, 110, 122 n. 75, 158, 173; distracted, 147-49, 168; exceptional sensibility of, 172f.; failure to learn, 33, 96, 97, 98, 103 and n. 34, 111, 113, 122 n. 75, 154, 171-75; on the fall of Troy, 113-15, 127-29; as false dream, 144f.; *furor* of, 92-94, 96, 99-102, 106, 110f., 127, 130-32, 156, 172; and golden bough, 160, 164, 166, 167f.; and human aspiration, 159; as hunter, 125f.; *immemor*, 149-54, 156, 159, 163 n. 66, 169; and individual values, 152, 156, 169; indoctrinated, 151, 159; motivation of, 133 n. 1, 152, 162; perversion of sensibility, 156-59; *pietas* of, 88, 94, 96, 100f., 110f., 132, 136, 152, 158f., 160; rape of pastoral Italy, 105 n. 38, 123 n. 76, 167f. and n. 78; reflective, 97f., 112f., 114f., 122f., 133, 149, 153, 168f.; response to suffering, 139, 152f., 158f., 169; Romanisation of, 133f., 150, 158, 172f.; as second Achilles, 102f., 154-56, 172; as Trojan hero, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 111 and n. 50, 138-41, 146, 148, 152, 155f., 157, 159, 162, 169, 171f., 174.
Aetna, 81
Africa, 125, 130
agrestis Musa, 26 and n. 31, 33, 34 n. 35
Agrippa, 145
Alba, 145
Alcimedon, 26 n. 32, 28
Aletes, 121
Alexandrian, 3, 4, 5, 41
Alexis, 27, 32
Allecto, 106, 130, 174 n. 94
Alphesiboeus, 29, 32
Amata, 102 n. 30, 131 n. 86, 171, 174 n. 94
Ambarvalia, 49 and n. 29
amor: *v.* love
Anchises: as Aeneas' father, 103, 133, 135, 138, 140, 160; funeral games of, 155; as ideological mouthpiece, 86, 92, 110, 135f., 141, 143, 144, 146, 150f., 159, 160, 162, 171; and the ivory gate, 144; on Lethe, 149f.; and Marcellus, 122f., 147; tomb of, 166
Androgeos: Cretan, 137f., 141; Greek, 129, 138
Andromache, 115
Anna, 105
Antaeus, 94
Anxur, 94
Apollo: Aeneas dedicates shield to, 139; and Augustus, 77 n. 90; and Bacchus, 24; as dissembling god, 148 n. 32, 149, 161; gifts to Iapyx, 69 n. 72; Haemonides priest of, 94; temples of: at Cumae (*v.* also Daedalus: temple doors of), 136, 147, 148, 168, and on Palatine, 44 n. 15, 145
Apollonius Rhodius, 35
Aratus, 5, 35, 37, 58 n. 41
Arcadia, Arcadian, 31, 33, 69, 78, 91, 163, 167 n. 78, 172, 175
Ariadne, 139
Aristaeus, 68, 69, 73 and n. 79, 74 nn. 82&84, 75, 77f., 81; analogy with Augustus, 77 n. 90, 81
Aristotle, 4, 6, 13
Arrowsmith W., 1 n. 2
Arruns, 123
Ascanius: Aeneas and, 133 n. 1, 163 n. 66; and pet stag, 125f., 130, 163, 171; portent, 129; promises to Nisus, 121, 153; pursuit of *fama*, 163
Ascraean song, 25, 33, 36 and n. 1, 37 and nn. 4f., 39, 75, 76, 83f. (*v.* also Hesiod)
Auden W. H.: 'Secondary Epic', 8
Augustus, 6-10, 17 n. 6, 39-47, 55, 76-83, 87, 88 n. 8, 93, 98 n. 23, 107, 136, 145, 146, 165, 174, 177-79; at Actium, 93, 145; analogies: with Aeneas, 7, 93 and n. 16, 98 n. 23, 174, with Aristaeus, 77 n. 90, 81; figure of Jovian world, 79-82; and golden age, 44,

83, 165; as god, 17 n. 6, 40-42, 43f., 45, 77, 86f. and n. 3; ideals of, 107; and Jupiter's prophecy, 87 n. 4; *Res Gestae*, 45 n. 17, 87 n. 5, 136 n. 8; as second founder of Rome, 44 and n. 16, 77; sinister portrait on Aeneas' shield, 173 n. 90; as source of hope, 39-42, 76-78; as subject-matter of Virgil's poetry, 6-10, 46f., 79f.; triple triumph of, 43f., 178

Bacchus, 24, 72
bees, 65-68, 73, 77, 101 n. 29, 102, 175
Barthes R., 1 n. 1, 13
biographical fallacy, 9f.
Blake W., 11
Boreas, 109
Bowra M., 6, 8
brightness, 145f. and n. 27, 166
bugonia, 69 n. 72, 73, 74f. and n. 83, 77 n. 90, 78, 81
Buthrotum, 115, 155
Byron G. Lord, 8

Caesar C. Julius, 18 n. 9, 23 n. 21, 30 n. 40, 51, 177f.; star of, 41f.; temple of, 44 n. 15, 178
Caesar C. Julius Octavianus: *v.* Augustus
Caieta, 162
Callimachus, 5, 20, 24 n. 25, 25 n. 28, 26 and n. 29, 35, 37, 81f.
Camers, 94
Camilla, 123 and n. 78, 131 n. 86, 167 and n. 78, 171; as symbol of pastoral Italy, 123
Camilli, 39
Camões L., 8
Camps W., 9
Cartault A., 8
Carthage, 102, 155, 156, 173
Cassandra, 171
Cato, 36 n. 2
Catullus, 5, 21, 22, 24 and n. 23, 35
chariot image, 51f., 57, 77
classical scholarship, 3; and philological method, 11
Cleopatra, 173 n. 90
Cloreus, 171
Columella, 5, 36 n. 2, 74 n. 83
comparative literature, 10
Comparetti D., 8
compassion, 19, 22, 24, 32, 38, 47, 72, 99, 105, 109, 110, 113, 117 n. 62, 139, 157-59, 169, 172, 173
condere, 111 and n. 51
Cornelius Severus, 6
Coroebus, 171
Corycian *senex*, 65 and nn. 58&60, 68
Corydon, 21, 22, 27, 32, 170
Crete, Cretan, 136, 139, 140, 141
Creusa, 114f., 119, 131 n. 86, 133, 138, 140, 153
Cumae, 133, 139, 141
cunctari, 120 n. 69, 158, 167f. and n. 75
Cupid, 103 n. 35, 118
cupido: *v.* love
Cyrene, 74 nn. 82&84

Daedalus: failure of, 140f.; parallel with Aeneas, 139-41; temple doors of, 28 n. 38, 136-41, 146, 147f., 154, 168, 173, 176
Damoetas, 22, 32
Damon, 29, 32
Dante, 3, 10
Daphnis, 22, 23 n. 21, 30f., 32, 39, 41f., 43, 44, 82
Daunus, 103, 110, 157
death, 59, 60-64, 67, 70-72, 73, 80, 90f., 93-97, 98, 110f., 118f., 123f., 130f., 138, 140, 141f., 146, 160-62, 164f.
Decii, 39
deductum carmen, 5, 24-26
deer, 60 n. 48, 108, 125f., 163
Deiphobus, 129, 134f., 148, 152f., 168, 171
Derrida J., 1 n. 1, 11 n. 34
determinism, 174f.
didacticism, 4, 6, 14, 20, 23, 25, 30f., 33, 36f., 37-39
Dido: Aeneas' love for, 117, 133, 139, 152, and gifts to, 170; and Anna, 105; *furor* of, 88, 116, 129f., 138, 171; generosity of, 116f.; parallels: with Amata, 102 n. 30, with Ariadne, 139, with Cleopatra, 173 n. 90, with fall of Troy, 119f., with Pasiphae, 138, with Turnus, 101, 108, 125f.; reminders of, 153f. and n. 44; represents individual, 118f., 126, 134; resistance of, 168; responsibility of, 117f.; as sacrifice, 119, 131 n. 86; temple of, 103, 112, 142, 155, 172, 173, 176; tragedy of, 115-20, 135, 138, 153, 168; as victim, 103 n. 35, 116f., 118, 125f., 138, 151
Dirae, 105f., 169 n. 79
dislocation, 15-17, 20f., 33, 38, 60, 79f.
divine machinery, 103-6, 116f., 130 (*v.* also gods and entries under individual gods)
dog-star, 92f., 100
Donatus, 7
doves: Chaonian, 14, 29f., 38f., 45f., 176; of Venus, 166
Drances, 99
Dryden J., 8
Dryope, 94
Dudley D., 5
Du Quesnay I., 9

echoic Muse, 12f., 18 and n. 10, 26, 34f., 38, 82, 176
Egypt, Egyptian, 75, 78
Eliot T. S., 174
Elysium, 133 n. 1, 135, 140
empire, 45, 85, 88, 99, 106, 117f., 138; ideology of, 44f., 87, 91f., 99, 109, 110, 133f., 135f., 146, 148, 149, 150, 173; ideology/practice dichotomy, 89, 92,94, 97,98f., 107, 111, 130, 131f., 136, 139, 145, 173; as *imago*, 140f., 166, 173 n. 90; and individual suffering, 111-24, 146-51, 153,154, 160; and pastoral Italy, 105, with opposition of pastoral world to, 167f.; promises of, 111, 113, 114, 141, 145f., 159f., 162, 165, and failure of these promises, 113, 140f., 146, 160 (*v.* also *fama*, ideal/real dichotomy, Rome, sacrifice, urban values)
Ennius, 6, 47
entropy, 50f., 53, 171
Epicurus, 23
Euphrates, 81
Euryalus, 89-92, 120f., 146 n. 27, 163, 164, 171; anguish of mother, 121; desire for *fama*, 120f., 163, 169 n. 79; as sacrifice, 131 n. 86; youth of, 120f.
Eurydice, 69, 70, 71 n. 75, 73 n. 79, 74 n. 84, 78
Evander, 66 n. 62, 93 n. 19, 94, 121f., 156 and n. 55, 163, 167 n. 78

false dreams, 142 n. 21, 143-46 (*v.* also empire: ideology of, ivory gate)
fama, 46, 87, 130, 153, 159-68; as compensation, 113, 115, 121, 122f., 158, 159f., 160f., 162, 165, 169; and cost, 89, 119-24, 147, 153, 154, 173; desire for, 59, 112, 120f., 130, 151 and n. 40, 156, 158f., 162, 163, 168, 172, 173; and *furor*, 167; as lifeless immortality, 160-62, 164, 165n. 70; parasitic nature of, 166 (*v.* also empire: promises of)
farmer/soldier analogy, 48 and n. 24, 52, 56 n. 38, 73
Faunus, 94, 104f., 167
fire imagery, 80, 90f., 92, 93, 94, 100, 106f., 114, 116, 119, 126-32, 151, 155, 163, 173 n. 90
forgetfulness, 14, 149-54, 156, 159, 163, 169 and n. 79, 170
fratricide, 79, 80
Freud S., 10
furor, 31, 33, 64, 70, 72, 76, 80, 84, 87, 88, 89-94, 97, 98f., 100, 101, 102, 106f., 108f., 110, 114, 126-32, 135, 145, 146, 151, 167f., 171, 175; and human failure, 170f.; and *pietas*, 87f., 96, 100, 110, 132, 146

Gallus: and Arcadia, 34, 163; failure to learn, 30-34, 72, 175; and fourth *Georgic*, 68 n. 68; passion for war, 30f., 33, 38f.; as poet, 20, 25 and n. 28, 26 n. 32, 30f., 38, 72; and sexual passion, 21f., 30f., 31, 33, 38f., 72, 131, 170, 175; Virgil's love for, 22, 32
genericism, 4-9, 10, 12
gods, 87, 174; indifference of, 52f., 61; as symbols of psychological forces, 174 and n. 94 (*v.* also divine machinery and entries under individual gods)
gold, 141, 153 n. 44, 164f. and n. 71; desire for, 171
golden age, 10, 22f. and n. 21, 44, 55, 57, 58 and n. 41, 62, 83, 141, 165, 175 (*v.* also Saturn)
golden bough, 105 n. 38, 120 n. 69, 139, 141, 145, 164-68, 170; compared to mistletoe, 165f.; and serpent, 166f.
Gransden K., 8
Graves R., 8
Greeks, 112, 127

Hades, 134, 139, 152
Haemonides, 93f., 131 n. 86
Hector, 102f., 115, 127, 163 n. 66
Heidegger M., 10
Heinze R., 8
Helen, 170, 171
Helenus, 115, 155
heroic impulse, 94 and n. 20, 110, 113f., 115, 130, 134, 154f., 163
Hesiod, 6, 22, 25 and n. 28, 26 and nn. 29f., 29, 33, 35, 36f., 37 n. 6, 39, 72, 75; idea of golden age, 22; paradigm of didacticism, 25f., 29, 33, 36f., 39, 72, 75; Virgil's relationship to, 6, 25 n. 28, 26 and nn. 29f., 35, 37 and n. 6, 48f., 75 (*v.* also Ascraean song)
Hirsch E., 10
historical context, 4, 9f., 16, 23f., 35, 39-47, 76, 79, 87 n. 4, 101, 177-79
historicism, 10, 11, 12
Homer: Aeneas as Achilles, 155f., 172; alleged imitation of, 99 n. 27; and the ivory gate, 142 n. 21, 143f., 145; reverberations of: in Aristaeus epyllion, 75 and n. 88, in Palinurus story, 161, in twelfth *Aeneid*, 102f.
Horace, 6f., 26 n. 32, 44 n. 16, 53, 72 n. 77, 101
Hortensius, 6
human condition, 14, 47, 58, 64, 75 and n. 88, 78, 84, 145
human failure, 75, 141, 152, 170-76; and Aeneas, 72, 124, 131f., 140f., 171-75; and

Daedalus, 139-41; and Gallus, 30f., 33, 72, 131, 175; and Orpheus, 70, 72, 131, 175
hunting imagery, 101 and n. 29, 198f., 116, 118, 125f.

Iapyx, 69 n. 72
Icarus, 140f., 147
ideal/real dichotomy, 16, 19, 23 and n. 21, 29f. and n. 40, 31, 33, 42, 47 n. 21, 54, 56, 57f., 62, 64f., 70, 77f., 82, 84, 114, 175f. (*v.* also empire: ideology/practice dichotomy)
imagery, 2, 11, 19 n. 14, 42, 45, 52, 57, 58, 71f., 101 and n. 29, 107f., 116, 118, 119, 124-32, 140, 154f., 164, 172 (*v.* also entries under individual images)
immemor: *v.* forgetfulness
indignatus, 83 and n. 102
individual suffering: and pursuit of empire, 111-24, 133, 146, 148, 149, 151, 153; and urban values, 15-19 (*v.* also injustice, tragedy)
inefficacy of art: art as *pictura inanis*, 13, 27 n. 35, 28 n. 38, 103 n. 34, 112f. and n.54, 155, 176; failure of art to teach, 28 n. 38, 103 and n. 34, 112f., 155, 172-74, 175f.; failure of the artist, 139-41; impotence of poetry, 13f., 15, 24-30, 34f., 46, 47, 72f., 75, 76, 82, 175f.; misreading of Virgil's text, 1-14, 176
injustice, 53, 70f., 72, 75, 99, 116f., 119, 120, 135, 160f. (*cf.* justice)
interpretive methodology, 1-14 and nn. 1f., 88 n. 8
intertextuality, 4, 12f., 16, 20-31, 33-35, 36-50, 53f., 58, 60-62, 65, 69, 72f., 75-78, 81f., 84, 87, 101-103, 106, 113f., 131, 136, 143-45, 152, 161, 163, 167 n. 78, 170, 172, 175f.
Iris, 119
iron age, 83
irony, 2, 12, 79, 83, 91, 104, 121, 146, 156 n. 55, 160, 161
Ismarus, 55
Italy, 54f., 99, 103 n. 35, 111, 130, 133, 136, 154, 172; *furor* of Italians, 89, 120; Italian youths sacrificed by Aeneas, 98, 99, 155; pastoral quality of, 19, 105, 123, raped by Aeneas, 167f.; quest for, 85f., 114; as *Saturnia tellus*, 55, 57f., 79, 83; soldiers of, 42, 83 (*v.* also *Laudes Italiae*)
Iulus: *v.* Ascanius
ivory gate, 14, 142 and n. 21, 143-45, 162, 166

Johnson S., 5
joy, 48, 54, 56, 58 n. 41, 97, 150f., 159, 172f.
Juno: colloquy with Jupiter, 86, 87 n. 5, 106; as Proserpina, 164, 167; as Saturnian goddess, 106; as symbol of *furor*, 100, 106, 126f. and n. 82, 171; temple at Carthage, 154, 156 (*v.* also Dido: temple of); and Venus, 103 n. 5, 118
Jupiter: Aeneas' appeal to, 102; analogy with Augustus, 43, 81; colloquy with Juno, 86, 87 n. 5, 106, with Venus, 86, 155; god of postlapsarian age, 58; ideological prophecy of, 86f., 88f., 91, 98, 140f.; and Juturna, 105; supports pursuit of *fama*, 163; Theodicy of, 48f.; use of *Dira*, 106
justice, 45 n. 17, 53, 58, 63, 64, 81 f. (*cf.* injustice)
Juturna, 105, 110, 167 and n. 78

Klingner F., 12 n. 35

labor, 33, 48-51, 52 n. 33, 55-58, 60, 63, 65f., 67f., 70, 72f., 152, 175; and *amor*, 60, 66, 69f.; and *fructus*, 48f., 57f., 60, 61f., 64f., 66 n. 63, 67, 69, 77, 83, 163 n. 66
lacrimae rerum, 112f., 152 (*v.* also tragedy)
Laocoon, 119, 128f., 166
Latinus, 99, 102, 104, 167, 170, 171
Latium, 130, 154, 155, 165, 170, 171
Laudes Italiae, 36, 39, 42, 46, 54-56, 76, 77, 82-84
Lausus, 94-96, 97, 98, 121-23, 131 n. 86, 158f., 171; *fama* as compensation, 96, 158f.; parallel with Pallas, 98; *pietas* of, 95f.; as sacrifice, 131 n. 86
Lavinia, 109, 167, 171
Leander, 60, 170
Lethe, 14, 150, 170
Liger, 94
Linus, 26 and n. 32
love: *amor habendi*, 66 and n. 62; *dira cupido*, 41 n. 9, 42, 169 and n. 79; of glory— *v.* *fama*: desire for; personal v. impersonal, 153; sexual passion (destructive), 21, 30f., 33, 38f., 59f., 64, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72f., 117-19, 138, 171; spiritual (creative), 17, 22, 32, 65f., 152; of war, 22, 31, 33, 38f.; of wealth and power, 33, 41 n. 9, 42, 171
Lucagus, 94
Lucas, 94
Lucretius: and *aeternum uulnus*, 127 n. 82; on *agrestis Musa* and *siluestris Musa*, 33f. and n. 45; on agricultural progress, 54 n. 36; apotheosis of Epicurus, 23, 76; on Ennius, 47 n. 20; form and content, 6; on human evolution, 48 n. 25, 49; and *labor-fructus* ideal, 58 n. 41; and *naturae foedera*, 78 and n. 93; pessimism of, 50 n. 30; and plague, 61 and n. 50; reverberations of: in *Eclogues*,

35, in *Georgics*, 37 and n. 6, 78; on sexual passion, 21
Lycoris, 31 f.

Magus, 93 f.
man and nature, 16, 20f., 22, 38, 48, 54, 56, 58, 62, 69
Mantua, 30 n. 41
Marcellus, 120 n. 70, 122f., 146f., 150, 159, 168
Marii, 39
Mars, 30, 31, 39, 87, 109, 127 n. 82
McKay A., 8
mediaeval commentators, 8
Meliboeus, 15-19, 22, 27, 32, 34
Menalcas, 22, 23 n. 20, 29, 30 n. 41, 32, 62
Messapus, 101, 146 n. 27
Mezentius, 94, 95, 96f., 98, 121, 171
Misenus, 131 n. 86, 160f., 162, 164, 165, 168
Moeris, 29
Mopsus, 22, 26 n. 32
mythologism, 10

Naevius, 6
nature, 47, 64, 69, 78; generosity of, 56f.; and golden bough, 167f.; and man— *v.* man and nature; *naturae foedera*, 47f., 78 and n. 93; variety of, 54, 58, 65 n. 58
neoterics, 5, 35
Nicander, 5, 37
Nisus, 89-92, 107, 120f., 146 n. 27, 153, 163, 164, 171, 174; desire for *fama*, 120f., 163, 169 n. 79; *furor* of, 90f., 107, 171; as sacrifice, 131 n. 86; youth of, 120f.
Numa, 94

Octavian: *v.* Augustus
Olympians, 105
Orpheus, 68 n. 68, 69-73, 74 nn. 82&84, 75, 77f., 82, 114, 131, 152, 170, 175; and *bugonia*, 73, analogy with rebirth of Rome, 77f.; echoic last words, 71 n. 75, 82; and Eurydice, 69-71 and nn. 73&75; as human paradigm, 75 and n. 88, 175; as ideal singer, 72f.; *immemor*, 71, 152; recalled in account of Creusa's loss, 114f.; and sexual passion, 70, 72f., 131, 170, 175; significance of, 75
Otis B., 6, 9, 12 n. 35
otium, 17, 81 f.
Ovid, 3, 7

Page T., 4f., 8, 9
Palaemon, 23 n. 21, 29
Palinurus: Aeneas forgets, 153; Aeneas saddened by, 152 and n. 41; colloquy with Aeneas, 149; *fama* as compensation, 160-62, 164; injustice of fate, 120 n. 69, 135, 161, 162 n. 62; resistance of, 120 n. 69, 168; as sacrifice, 131 n. 86, 138, 161; Sibyl's reprimand of, 161f., 169; in the underworld, 134f., 148f., 161f., 168; as victim, 103 n. 35
Pallas, 93, 94, 98, 99, 111, 121-23, 131 n.86, 146, 153, 155, 156-58, 163, 164, 167 n. 78, 171; desire for *fama*, 163f., 171; *fama* as compensation, 122f.; parallels with Lausus, 98, 121, 123; as sacrifice, 123, 131 n. 86
paradox, 4, 47, 76-84
Pasiphae, 21, 22, 32, 137, 138, 170
pastoral world, 15-19, 20, 30f., 38, 56f., 69, 82, 167 and n. 78; Italy as, 19, 105, 123, 167
Patroclus, 155
picturae inanes: *v.* inefficacy of art
pietas, 45 n. 17, 87 and n. 5, 88, 94, 95f., 97, 99, 100, 101, 106, 110, 111, 117 and n. 62, 132, 135, 136, 146, 152 and nn. 42f., 153, 158; and *furor*, 87f., 96, 100, 110, 132, 146; personal replaced by impersonal, 153
Pindar, 9, 47
poetic enclosure, 34f.
poetic ideal, 24-26, 29, 37f., 45, 72, 75
poet as teacher: *v.* didacticism
poetry: failure of— *v.* inefficacy of art; power of, 46, 72; song as *labor*, 33, 69f.; as teaching medium— *v.* didacticism
politics: *v.* historical context
Pollio, 22, 30, 32, 38, 45
Pompey: and pirates, 65 n. 60
postlapsarian man, 15, 32, 44, 79, 81
Prescott H., 8, 9
Priam, 102, 103, 127, 129, 156, 170, 171
Propertius, 6f., 44 n. 16, 87 n. 5
Proserpina, 164
Proteus, 69, 70, 73, 75
Pygmalion, 171
Pyrrhus, 102, 127, 129, 146 n. 27, 154f., 156, 172

Quintilian, 5

reincarnation, 149f.
Remus, 79, 80
Renaissance, 8
Robbe-Grillet A., 2
Romantics, 8
Rome: Aeneas and, 124, 133f., 149f., 154, 158f., 172f., 174; attitude to epic at, 6, 8f.; Augustus as saviour of, 42, 44; birth of, 92f., 111; as civilising force, 45, 82, 85, 87, 106, 136, 159; destiny of, 79f., 86, 91, 111, 120, 133f., 145, 149f., 169, 172f.; early site of, 91, 172; enemies of, 83 and n. 103, 89; ideology of, 106, 124, 131f., 134, 136, 149f., 159, 173 and n. 90; imperial greatness of,

9f., 79, 86f., 136; injustice of calamity at, 53; political climate of, 9, 18 n. 9, 35, 51, 53, 64 and n. 55; Romulus and, 80; sacrifice demanded by, 160; as seat of urban values (*q.v.*), 15, 19, 79; spiritual malaise of, 22, 51f., 53, 79; spiritual rebirth of, 39f., 73, 77, 78, 83; Venus as ancestress, 103f., 172; Virgil's poetic *œuvre* and, 8, 13f., 35, 47, 51, 79f., 85 (*v.* also empire)
Romulus, 43, 44, 77, 80, 87
Rutuli, Rutulian, 92, 106, 124, 171

Saces, 109
sacrifice: animal, 75 n. 85, 80, 81; human, 93f., 98f. and n. 23, 131 n. 86, 137, 141 n. 19, 155f.; of individuals, 114 (Creusa), 119 (Dido, Laocoon), 123 (Pallas, Camilla), 131 (Turnus), 138 (Palinurus), 160 (Misenus), 161 (Palinurus)— *v.* also 131 n. 86; of youth by empire, 120-24, 141 and n. 19, 146f.
Saturn: as agricultural god, 58 n. 41; god of prelapsarian age, 57, 62, 68f., 81, 83, 91, 172, 175; Italy as *Saturnia tellus*, 36, 55, 57f., 79, 83, 106; and *labor-fructus* ideal, 63, 64; *Saturnia* as epithet of Juno, 106; *Saturnia regna* as golden age, 20, 106, 175
Scipiones, 139
Scullard H., 5
self-deception, 99, 111, 158
Sellar W., 8, 9
Seneca, 5, 36 n. 2
serpent imagery, 101, 126-32, 145, 154f., 166f., 173 n. 90
Servius, 7f., 142f.
sexual passion: *v.* love
shadows, 12f., 32f., 34, 164, 165, 175f.
shield: of Aeneas, 28 n. 38, 45, 83 n. 102, 86 n. 2, 91f., 93, 98, 141, 165 and n. 71, 172f. and n. 90, 176; of Augustus, 45 n. 17, 99 n. 25, 136 n. 8, 165 n. 71
Sibyl, 136, 144, 147f. and n. 32, 149, 150, 154, 155, 161, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171; association with Apollo, 149; distracts Aeneas, 147-49; as false dream, 144; false statement about golden bough, 167; prophecy of, 154-56, 170; reprimand of Palinurus, 161f.
Sicily, 103 n. 35, 155
Sidney P., 5
Silenus, 20, 22, 24-27, 32, 38; song of, 20, 24-27
siluestris Musa, 18, 26 and n. 31, 34 and n. 35
Simois, 115
Spenser E., 8
spiritual malaise, 16, 19f., 21, 22, 31f., 33, 38, 52f.
Stevens W., 2
storm imagery, 101, 116, 119, 126-32
structure, 27 n. 33, 30 n. 41, 33, 34, 76, 79, 86 n. 2, 99, 113, 133, 136, 152-54, 160, 164
Styx, 152, 168, 169
Sychaeus, 171
Syme R., 9

Taburnus, 55
Tarquitus, 94, 167 n. 78
Tartarus, 73, 148 and n. 33, 168
Tasso T., 8 and n. 20
Tenedos, 129, 166
text: and context, 4, 9f.; critical approaches to, 1-14 and nn. 1f.; and meaning, 1-3; misreading of, 3-10; particularity of, 11
Theocritus, 16, 26 n. 30, 27, 29, 30, 35, 37
theory of kinds: *v.* genericism
Theseus, 137, 139
Thetis, 155
'thisness', 11
Thucydides, 61
Thyrsis, 29
Tiber, 96f.
Tityrus, 15-19, 27, 34, 38
tragedy, 17, 22, 70-73, 75, 78, 89, 96, 105, 110, 111, 112f., 115, 116f., 120, 121, 123, 124, 126, 133, 141, 146, 148, 151, 153, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 169, 170-76; tragic cycle of history, 170f., 174f.
Trivia, 94
Trojans, 89, 90, 91, 92, 101, 120, 121; sacrilege of, 104f.
Troy: departure from, 130, 133 and n. 1; fall of, 101 and n. 29, 113f., 127-29, 151, 167, 171; 'heroic' violence at, 94, 112f., 113f., 127, 130, 134f., 155, 171f.; as origin of Rome, 8; relics of Troy as gifts, 170; renewal of, 115, 134f.; Trojan Aeneas— *v.* Aeneas: as Trojan hero; Trojan Caesar, 86, 174; Trojan Games, 139; Trojan War resurrected, 154-56, 170, 171f.
Turnus: animal imagery and, 107-9 and n. 48; and the *Dira*, 105, 106; duel with Aeneas, 100, 101, 105, 108, 130-32; *furor* of, 88, 89, 100, 106f., 108, 109, 110, 171; and heroic impulse, 110; as Italian hero, 103, 105, 109, 110, 111, 124, 130, 163; and Juturna, 105, 110; parallels with: Aeneas, 96, 101, Camilla, 124, Dido, 101, 108, 125f., fall of Troy, 101, Hector, 102f., 156, Priam, 102f., 156; *pietas* of, 94, 110; positive qualities of, 109f.; resistance of, 168; as sacrifice, 123f., 131 and n. 86; as second Achilles, 154 and n. 48; as suppliant, 103, 108, 110f., 157f.; sympathy engaged for, 107-10; tragic insight of, 109-11; as victim, 107-9; youth of, 108, 123f.

twin, 106 n. 41, 145, 153 n. 44, 166 and n. 73, 173 n. 90
Tyrrhus, 125f., 163, 171

urban values, 15-21, 33, 38, 56, 58 (*v.* also empire, Rome)

Varius, 7
Varro, 5, 36 n. 2, 37, 40, 65 n. 58, 74 n. 83
Venus, 42 n. 10, 86f., 103f. and n. 35, 105, 106, 118, 126, 138, 145, 155, 172 and n. 88, 173 n. 90; as ancestress of *gens Iulia*, 42 n. 10, 86, 103f., 126; brightness of, 145; colloquy with Jupiter, 86f., 155; as embodiment of Rome, 103f., 172 and n. 88; implied censure of, 103f., 106; opposed to Italian deities, 105; unscrupulousness of, 103f. and n. 35, 118, 173 n. 90; victims of, 103 n. 35, 118, 138
Virgil, 1, 3 and *passim*; *Aeneid*, 4, 5, 6-10, 27 n. 35, 28 n. 38, 34 n. 46, 35, 45, 46, 60 n. 48, 69 n. 72, 72f., 77 n. 90, 81, 83 n. 102, 84, 85-176; critique of urban values, 15-21, 33, 38, 56, 58; *Eclogues*, 3f., 4f., 15-35, 37-39, 41f., 43, 44, 45f., 46f., 58, 60, 62, 69, 70, 72f., 76, 77, 82, 84, 85, 88, 106, 113, 126, 131, 163, 170, 175, 176; on failure of Augustan/Roman ideology, 86-176; *Georgics*, 4, 5f., 8f., 20 n. 15, 25 n. 28, 34 n. 46, 36-84, 85, 87, 88, 102, 106, 114, 126, 131, 136, 152, 170, 175, 176; and Graeco-Roman literary tradition, 3f., 5f., 6f., 16, 20-21, 22f., 25-27, 29, 33f., 35, 36-38, 39, 47 and n. 20, 48f., 75, 76, 78, 81f., 85f., 99 n. 27, 101, 102f., 142-44, 149f., 155f., 161, 172; interreferentiality of *œuvre*, 4, 12f., 39, 41-47, 58, 60, 62, 69, 72, 76, 77f., 81f., 84, 87, 102, 106, 113, 114, 131, 136, 152, 163, 167 n. 78, 170f., 175f.; lives of, 7, 9; love for Gallus, 22, 32; misreading of, 3-10, 12-14, 176; optimism of, 10, 42, 46f., 73, 76-78, 83f.; as panegyricist of Rome and Augustus, 6-10, 39-47, 79f.; pessimism of, 9, 13, 30-35, 47, 64, 75, 76, 84, 89, 113, 168-76; poetic *templum* planned by, 9, 42f., 47, 79; semiological complexity of, 3f., 9
Volusius, 6
Vulcan, 86, 155, 168, 173 n. 90, 176

war: as aspect of iron age, 83; civil, 52f., 87; 'godless soldier', 18; as index of contemporary chaos, 51-53; with nature, 48-52; passion for, 22, 31, 33, 38f.; of Trojans in Italy, 89-111, 120-24, 130-32, 153-59, 163, 170, 171f.; Trojan War, 94, 101, 112-14, 127-30, 134f., 151, 155, 167, 171f.; 'spears of Mars', 14, 29f., 38f., 45f., 176; waged by Augustus, 43f., 47, 79f., 87, 93, 145
Williams R., 8, 9f.
Wittgenstein L., 1
wound imagery, 101, 108, 116, 118, 119, 126-32, 171

youth: misled by desire for *fama*, 163; sacrificed in pursuit of empire— *v.* sacrifice

Zeus, 155

INDEX LOCORUM

The following is a list of the main Virgilian passages discussed. Those merely cited as additional illustration are not included.

Eclogue 1.1	12
1-4	15
2	18
4	13, 33, 176
5	18, 34
8	17
10	18
11f.	15
45	18
59-62	16
64-78	17f.
73	18
74	34
77	18, 27, 34
79-83	16 n. 5
83	13, 33, 34, 176
Eclogue 2.4	27
5	13, 27, 176
28-55	19 n. 14
73	27
Eclogue 3.35-48	28
43	29
47	29
55-57	29
109	29
Eclogue 4.13	24
48-62	23 n. 22
60-63	22 n. 19
Eclogue 5.1-3	19 n. 14
56-64	22f.
79f.	41
90	24 n. 26
Eclogue 6.1-8	26
1-86	24f.
31-40	20
41-47	20
45-52	21
64-73	20, 38
67	30
67-71	25
71	39
74-81	22 n. 19
Eclogue 7.17	29
Eclogue 8.1-5	29
58-61	29
69-71	29
108	29 n. 39

Eclogue 9.1-6	15f.
11-13	14, 29f., 38, 45f.
21	16
46ff.	30 n. 40
46-49	41f.
50	18 n. 8
67	29
Eclogue 10.1	33
2	31, 34
9-31	30
10	31
17	30
22	31
44	31, 48 n. 26
47	31
60	31
62-69	30f.
64	33, 73
69	31 n. 43
70-77	31f.
71	4
72f.	34
75	34
75f.	12f., 175f.
75-77	32f.
77	34
Georgic 1.24-42	40-42, 44
27	45, 77, 81
40-42	46
43-117	47f.
60	47, 78
62f.	48 n. 25
99	48
121-46	48, 49 n. 28, 66 n. 63
125-28	58 n. 41
133	68 n. 69
133f.	49
145f.	50f.
146	66 n. 62
155-59	50
160	48
168	54
199-203	50
281-83	81
305ff.	50

	316 ff.	50
	328-34	81
	338-50	49 and n. 29
	351-463	49 and n. 29
	415 ff.	67 n. 66
	466	42
	471-73	81
	491 f.	52 f.
	494	57
	498-514	51-53
	502	73
	503	77
	512-14	77
Georgic	2.3-8	54
	9-258	54
	39	46 n. 18
	136-76	54-56, 82-84
	155-64	55 f.
	167-76	82 f.
	170	48 n. 26
	173-76	36
	176	25 n. 28, 39
	340 f.	48 n. 25
	380-96	72
	397-419	56
	433	56
	458-65	20 n. 15
	458-540	56-58
	461 ff.	66
	467 f.	82
	469	62
	471	62
	475-89	39 n. 7
	488	62
	495-512	20 n. 15, 79
	501	79, 82
	505 ff.	66
	513	57
	513-18	56 f.
	516 ff.	65
	519-31	57
	521	62
	525	62
	527-31	62
	533	79
	534-40	79
	537	80
	541 f.	77
Georgic	3.1-48	9, 46, 79 f.
	8-22	42 f.
	13	77
	18	77
	22-48	43 f.
	27	77, 79
	46-48	39 n. 7, 44, 80
	49-283	59 f.
	60	59
	66-68	59
	68	61
	96	59
	102	59
	103-12	59
	125	59
	128	59
	165	59
	215-41	59
	242 f.	67
	242-44	60
	244	66
	271-83	60
	295-477	60
	474-77	61
	478-81	61
	478-566	60-64
	479	62
	480	62, 67
	481	62
	494	62
	511-14	62
	515-24	62 f.
	515-30	68
	525-30	63
	537-40	62
Georgic	4.8-115	67
	116-48	65
	157	66
	162-64	65 n. 61
	167-69	65 n. 61
	177	66
	180	66
	197 f.	66, 70
	197-202	67 n. 65
	203 ff.	67, 70
	205	66
	208	67, 70
	219	67 and n. 66, 70
	219-27	67, 75 n. 89
	239-80	67
	293	78
	299-302	75 n. 85
	315	68 n. 69
	328	68 and n. 69
	345-47	69 n. 71
	392 f.	75
	453-59	69
	454	73
	455	70 f.
	460-63	69
	464-84	70
	485-93	70 f.

	490 ff.	152
	491 f.	70
	492	13, 34 n. 46, 72, 176
	511-15	71 f.
	520-22	72
	525-27	71 n. 75, 82
	547-58	74 f., 81
	548	74 n. 82
	554	74, 78
	559-62	44 f., 77
	559-66	80 f.
	560-62	136
	561	45
	563-66	12
Aeneid	1.1-7	85
	4	88, 100
	5	111
	29	127
	33	111
	36	126 f., 171
	50	127
	81 ff.	127
	94-101	133
	148 ff.	127
	148-53	88
	184-93	125 f.
	223-96	155
	253	87
	254	86 n. 2
	286-96	86 f.
	295 f.	98
	296	91, 107
	318 ff.	126
	368	77 n. 90
	430-36	65 n. 61, 77 n. 90, 102
	450 ff.	103
	453-65	112 f., 118
	464 f.	13, 27 n. 35, 34 n. 46, 103 n. 34, 155
	466-93	112 f., 118
	487	103
	603-5	116 f.
	647-55	170
	657 ff.	103 n. 35, 118, 127, 130
Aeneid	2.3	115
	199-227	128 f.
	222-24	119
	228 f.	129
	235 ff.	129
	297	127
	304 ff.	127
	309-17	113 f., 127
	311	129
	314-17	170 f.
	379-81	129
	416 ff.	127
	469-75	129
	479	102
	494	102
	499	127
	529	127
	552	129
	561	127
	575	127
	576	131 n. 87
	587	127
	681-84	129
	741	119
	790-94	114
	792 f.	140
Aeneid	3.200	139
	294-505	115
	304	115
	469	155
Aeneid	4.1-5	108
	66-73	108, 116, 125
	69 ff.	101 n. 29, 102
	90 ff.	103 n. 35, 118, 130
	129 ff.	101 n. 29
	160-68	116
	169-72	117 f.
	261-64	153 n. 44
	296 ff.	116
	393-96	117
	401 ff.	116
	497 f.	138
	504-21	116
	522-55	116
	646 f.	138
	667-71	119 f.
	673	105 f.
	693-705	118 f.
Aeneid	5.3	119
	5 f.	119
	7	120
	700-4	133
	814 f.	161
	815 f.	103 n. 35
	833-71	120, 161
	867	140
Aeneid	6.13	165
	14-30	137-39
	30-33	139-41
	37	148
	86-90	154
	86-97	170
	100	154

	133	152
	136-48	164
	143f.	170
	171-74	160
	190-211	164, 166f.
	205-9	165f.
	210f.	168
	232-35	160
	282-84	142
	332	152
	337-83	134f.
	340	161
	351-54	161
	370f.	161
	373-83	161f.
	398	149
	450-76	134f.
	455	152
	475f.	152
	494-547	134f.
	537-39	148
	546f.	134
	562-627	148 and n. 32
	629f.	149
	679ff.	144
	700-2	115, 140
	703-5	86 n. 2
	717	150
	718	150
	719-21	150, 154, 159, 168f.
	724-51	144f.
	748-51	149f., 170
	756-846	144
	756-853	86
	792f.	165
	806f.	151 n. 38
	847-53	135f., 144
	851	134, 150
	851-53	45, 159
	853	94, 110
	854	86 n. 2, 136, 146, 150, 159, 172
	855ff.	144
	860-66	146f.
	868	147
	882	123
	888-90	150f.
	893-98	142-46
Aeneid	7.1-4	162
	41	170
	243-48	170
	341ff.	174 n. 94
	481	125
	483-502	125f.
	496	163
	648	97

Aeneid	8.48	145
	82f.	145
	327	66 n. 62
	514-17	163
	520-22	156
	597-99	86 n. 2
	608	45
	609f.	86 n. 2
	619	86 n. 2
	626-728	86
	645	98
	672	165
	678-81	93
	685	43 n. 12
	728	45
	729-31	172
	730	86 n. 82, 92
	731	91, 165
Aeneid	9.184	90
	184f.	174
	195-97	163
	198	90
	266	153
	324-38	90
	339-41	90f., 108
	341	107
	342	90, 91
	343ff.	91
	350	90, 91
	354	91
	373	163
	424	91, 163
	446-49	91, 121
	473ff.	121
	498f.	121
	760f.	89
Aeneid	10.111-13	175
	261f.	92, 93
	270f.	93
	270-75	92, 100, 155
	433ff.	98 n. 22
	468f.	163
	510-605	93f.
	515-17	157
	519f.	98
	603f.	130
	762	94
	783	94
	787f.	94, 97
	791ff.	96
	809-32	95f.
	814f.	101
	825	123
	825-30	158
	829f.	158
	833-71	96f.

	874	97	435	73
	878-98	97	435-40	163 n. 66
	903-8	97	473 ff.	105
Aeneid	11.3	98	494-99	101
	14	98	498	104 f.
	22-28	98	500-50	101
	42-58	99, 122 f. and n. 75, 158	554 ff.	104
			565	102
	72-75	153	577	102
	81 f.	98	579	102
	111	99	587 ff.	102
	133	99	665-80	109 f.
	210	99	749 ff.	101 n. 29, 102
	445 f.	99	749-55	125
	447 ff.	99	766-71	104
	808-11	123	777-79	104
	816-31	123	807	106
	831	124	829	86 n. 2
	841 ff.	123	838-40	86
	910	100	871	105 f.
Aeneid	12.1-9	107 f.	883 f.	105
	1-106	106-8	919-52	130-32
	46	108	930	110
	107 f.	103	930-38	103
	107-11	100	930-52	157 f.
	167	100	942	146
	175	100	945	141
	175 ff.	107	945-52	130 f.
	219-21	108	947-49	111
	311 ff.	107	950	111
	311-14	100 f.	950-52	12, 124
	393 f.	69 n. 72	952	12, 124, 175